arXiv:1602.03614v2 [math.DG] 10 Jun 2016

The free-boundary Brakke flow

Nick Edelen*

June 13, 2016

Abstract

We define a notion of Brakke flow with free-boundary in a barrier surface, and prove this class admits compactness. We find we must weaken the original notion of Brakke flows to allow the flow to "pop" at the barrier. We define a Gaussian monotonicity formula valid at all points, and use this to adapt the local regularity theorem of White [20] to the free-boundary setting. Finally, we show Ilmanen's elliptic regularization procedure [9] extends to free-boundary Brakke flows.

1 introduction

A hypersurface Σ has geometric free-boundary in a barrier hypersurface S if $\partial\Sigma \subset S$, and Σ meets S orthogonally. This is a physically and mathematically natural boundary condition to impose on geometric problems-with-boundary, and has garnered increasing interest over the past several years.

In the 90's Stahl [17] proved long-time existence of the smooth, compact, free-boundary mean curvature flow, in the sense that curvature blow-up must occur at a finite-time singularity. Some progress has been made analysing mean-convex singularities through smooth blow-ups: via a particular monotonicity formula Buckland [4] proved type-I singularities are modelled on generalized cylinders (with free-boundary in a plane), and recently the author [5] proved type-II singularites can be realized by translating solitons, via the Huisken-Sinestrari estimates. Many others have considered smooth free-boundary curvature flows, including [10], [16], [19], [11], [13].

We are interested in weak free-boundary mean curvature flows. Just recently Volkmann [18] proved existence of the free-boundary level-set flow for mean-convex initial data. Mizuno and Tonegawa [15] constructed Brakke flows (in the original sense) with a free-boundary condition in convex domains, via the Allen-Cahn functional.

In this paper we define a notion of Brakke flow with free-boundary, and prove a compactness theorem for this class. The key trouble in making the "right" definition is illustrated in the following simple example: let V_k be the regular k-gon inscribed in a circle. Each V_k is a stationary 1-varifold, with free-boundary

*nedelen@stanford.edu

in the circle, and therefore by any reasonable definition is a Brakke flow with free-boundary. However, taking $k \to \infty$, the $V_k \to S^1$ as varifolds, which is not anymore a Brakke flow!

However we are saved because "in the directions tangential to S^1" we are still a Brakke flow. We therefore must relax Brakke's original definition. An interesting consequence is that our definition requires the flow to "pop" or "break-up" upon tangential contact with the barrier. This is in contrast to to the smooth free-boundary mean curvature flow, for which the barrier is "invisible."

We additionally prove a monotonicity formula valid at all points, which gives an upper-semi-continuous notion of Gaussian density. The formula given in [4] is valid only along the boundary, and even for flat barriers only reduces to the standard Gaussian of the relfected flow when centered on the barrier.

Using our reflected Gaussian density we adapt the regularity arguments of White [20], to prove an "easy Brakke theorem" for free-boundary smooth flows, and limits of smooth flows. Writing $\Theta_{refl(S)}(\mathcal{M}, X, r)$ for our modified Guassian density ratio of $\mathcal{M}$, at spacetime point X and scale r, we prove:

Theorem 1.1. *There are constants $\epsilon(n)$, $C(n, \kappa)$ so that the following holds: Let $(M_t^n)_t$ be a classical mean curvature flow supported in $\overline{\Omega} \subset R^N$, having free-boundary in $S = \partial\Omega$. Here S is a smooth hypersurface, with C^4-norm bounded by κ.*

Write $\mathcal{M} = \{(x,t) : x \in M_t\} \subset R^{N,1}$ for the spacetime track of M. Suppose there is an open subset $\mathcal{U} \subset R^{N,1}$, so that $\mathcal{M}$ is closed in $\mathcal{U}$, and satisfies

$$\Theta_{refl(S)}(\mathcal{M}, Y, r) < 1 + \epsilon$$

for every $Y \in \mathcal{U}$, and $r \in (0, d(Y, \partial\mathcal{U}))$. Here d is the parabolic *distance.*

Then for every $(y,t) \in \mathcal{U}$, we have the bound

$$|\mathrm{II}_t(y)| d((y,t), \partial\mathcal{U}) \leq C,$$

where $\mathrm{II}_t(y)$ is the second fundamental form of M_t at y.

We prove the existence of tangent flows, which are always self-shrinkers either without boundary, or with free-boundary in a plane. In the latter case one can reflect to obtain a self-shrinking Brakke flow without boundary.

A key Corollary of Theorem 1.1 is the following:

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a free-boundary Brakke flow supported in $\overline{\Omega}$, where $\partial\Omega$ is the smooth barrier. If $\mathcal{M}$ can be realized as the limit of classical free-boundary mean curvature flows, then the following holds:*

If any (reflected) tangent flow of $\mathcal{M}$ at X is a multiplicity one (quasi-)static plane, then $\mathcal{M}$ is smooth, multiplicity one in a spacetime neighborhood of X.

We further adapt Ilmanen's elliptic regularization to prove existence of the free-boundary Brakke flow, and short-time existence of the classical free-boundary mean curvature flow from embedded, smooth initial data.

I express my deepest gratitude to my advisors Simon Brendle and Brian White, and to my friend Otis Chodosh, for their guidance and support. This work borrows heavily from a series of lectures given by White at Stanford in Spring 2015, and Ilmanen's book on Elliptic Regularization [9].

2 preliminaries

We live in R^N. Given a sequence of open sets U_i, U in R^N, we say $U_i \to U$ *as open sets* if

$$W \subset\subset U \iff W \subset\subset U_i \quad \forall i >> 1,$$

for every precompact open W. If the U_i, U have smooth boundary, we say $U_i \to U$ in $C^{k,\alpha}$ if $U_i \to U$ as open sets, the $\partial U_i \to \partial U$ locally graphically in $C^{k,\alpha}$.

Let $S \subset R^N$ be an embedded, oriented hypersurface, with orienting normal ν_S. A surface M *meets* S *orthogonally* if $\partial M \subset S$, and the outward conormal of $\partial M \subset M$ coincides with ν_S. We will often say an M meeting S orthogonally has *classical free-boundary* in S.

A family of immersions $F_t : M^n \times [0,T)$ is a *classical mean curvature flow with free-boundary* in S if

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t F_t(p) = H_t(p), \text{ for all } p \in M \text{ and } t > 0, \text{ and} \\ &F_t(M) \text{ meets } S \text{ orthogonally, for } t \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

here $H_t(p)$ being the mean curvature vector of $F_t(M)$ at p.

2.1 varifolds

We will work extensively with integral varifolds. Recall an n-varifold V in $U \subset R^N$ is a Radon measure on the Grassmanian $U \times Gr(n,N)$. Here $Gr(n,N)$ is the space of unoriented n-planes in R^N. We denote the mass measure of V by μ_V, i.e. so $\mu_V = \pi_\sharp V$, with $\pi : U \times G(n,N) \to U$ being the projection.

We say V is *integral* if there is a collection of C^1 manifolds N_i, and subsets $S_i \subset N_i$, so that

$$V(\phi(x,L)) = \sum_i \int_{S_i} \phi(x, T_x N_i) d\mathcal{H}^n.$$

The tangent plane $T_x N_i$ is well-defined $\mathcal{H}^n$-a.e. in S_i. Equivalently, V is integral if

$$\mu_V = \mathcal{H}^k \llcorner \theta \llcorner M$$

for some countably n-rectifiable set M, and some locally-$(\mathcal{H}^k \llcorner M)$-integrable function θ, taking non-negative integer values. An integral varifold is uniquely determined by its mass measure.

Given a C^1 vector field in R^N, and an n-plane L, write

$$div_L(X) = tr_L(DX) = \sum_i < D_{e_i} X, e_i >,$$

for any orthonormal basis (e_i) of L. For an integral varifold V, we write div_V to mean $div_{T_x V}$, and $tr_V = tr_{T_x V}$, wherever the tangent plane exists.

The *first variation* for mass of an integral varifold has the expression

$$\delta V(X) = \int div_V(X) d\mu_V, \quad X \in C^1_c(U, R^N).$$

We say δV is locally finite if

$$|\delta V(X)| \leq C_W |X|_{C^0} \quad \forall X \in C^1_c(W, R^N), W \subset\subset U$$

If δV is locally finite then we can define the total variation (Radon) measure

$$||\delta V||(W) = \sup\{\delta V(Y) : Y \in C^1_c(W, R^N)\} \quad \forall W \subset\subset U,$$

and therefore differentiate to obtain

$$\delta V(X) = -\int H \cdot X d\mu_V + \int X \cdot \nu d\sigma_V.$$

Here $H_V = -\frac{d||\delta V||}{d\mu_V}$ is the *generalized mean curvature vector*, $\sigma_V = ||\delta V||_{sing}$ is the *generalized boundary measure*, and ν_V is the *generalized outwards conormal*.

2.2 regularity scales and reflection

Let u be a function into R^{N-n}, defined on some subset of $U \subset R^n$. We define the following (semi-)norms

$$\begin{aligned}
|u|_{0,U} &= \sup_{x \in U \cap \mathrm{dom}(u)} |u(x)| \\
[u]_{\alpha,U} &= \sup_{x \neq y \in U \cap \mathrm{dom}(u)} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{|x - y|^\alpha} \\
[u]_{k,\alpha,U} &= [D^k u]_{\alpha,U}, \\
|u|_{k,\alpha,U} &= [u]_{k,\alpha,U} + \sum_{i \leq k} |D^i u|_{0,U}.
\end{aligned}$$

(This is not the scale-invariant $C^{k,\alpha}$-norm.) Note we do not require u to be defined on all of U.

Let S be a smooth n-surface in R^N, and $x \in S$. We define the C^k *regularity scale* of S at x, written as $r_k(S, x)$, to be the largest radius r so that, after a suitable rotation, the translated and dilated surface

$$(S - x)/r \cap (B^n_1 \times B^{N-n}_1)$$

coincides with the graph of some $u : U \subset B^n_1 \to R^{N-n}$, satisfying $|u|_{k,B^n_1} \leq 1$. The $C^{k,\alpha}$ *regularity scale* is defined in precisely the same manner, and is denoted by $r_{k,\alpha}(S, x)$.

Notice that r_2 bounds the inscribed radius from below, so a bound on r_2 is stronger than a bound on the second fundamental form.

Equivalently, the C^k (or $C^{k,\alpha}$) regularity scale is the largest r for which

$$S \cap ((B^N_r(x) \cap L^n) \times (B^N_r(x) \times L^\perp)) \subset \mathrm{graph}_L(u), \tag{1}$$

where L^n is some affine n-plane, and $u : U \subset L \to L^\perp$ is a function satisfying

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k} r^{i-1} |D^i u|_{0,U} \quad \left(+ r^{k+\alpha-1} [D^k u]_{\alpha,U} \text{ if } C^{k,\alpha}\right) \leq 1.$$

If we take $L = T_x S$, then $u(0) = Du(0) = 0$, and we see that the regularity scale is always positive. The best scale may not be achieved by $L = T_x S$ though.

We define the *global regularity scale* $r_{k,\alpha}(S) = \inf_{x \in S} r_{k,\alpha}(S, x)$.

Throughout the rest of this paper we fix in notation $S^{N-1} \subset R^N$ as our smooth, embedded, oriented *barrier hypersurface*. Write ν_S for the orienting unit normal, and $d(x)$ for the signed distance function to S. Let $\zeta(x)$ be the nearest point projection of x onto S.

We define the *reflection across* S of a point x to be

$$\tilde{x} = 2\zeta(x) - x.$$

Given a vector $v \in T_x R^N$, we define its reflection across S to be

$$\tilde{v} = (D\tilde{x})|_x(v) \in T_{\tilde{x}} R^N.$$

We shall only consider ζ and $\tilde{x}$ as defined in sufficiently small neighborhood of S, so both are smooth functions of x.

Pick a point in $y \in S$, and for simplicity assume $y = 0$, and $T_y S = R^{N-1} \times \{0\}$. Let $r_3(S, y) = \rho$, and take $u : B_\rho^{N-1}(0) \to R$ to be the graph in (1) realizing r_3. We define the *inverse projection map* at y to be

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(x, s) &= (x, u(x)) + s\nu_S(x) \\ &= (x, u(x)) + \frac{s(-Du, 1)}{\sqrt{1 + |Du|^2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

One can check directly (since $\Phi(0) = 0$, $D\Phi(0) = 0$) that, for any $r \leq \rho$, on $B_r^{N-1}(0) \times [-r, r]$ we have the estimates

$$|\Phi - Id| \leq c(n)\frac{r^2}{\rho}, \quad |D\Phi - Id| \leq c(n)\frac{r}{\rho}, \quad |D^2\Phi|_0 \leq c(n). \tag{3}$$

If we further have $[u]_{k,\alpha,B_\rho} \leq 1$, then

$$\rho^{k+\alpha-1}[D^k\Phi]_{\alpha, B_\rho^{N-1} \times [-\rho,\rho]} \leq c(n, k, \alpha).$$

We make the following definition out of convenience. For $x \in S$, define the *reflection regularity scale* $r_S(x)$ to be the largest radius $\leq r_3(S, x)$ so that:

A) on $B_{r_S}^N(x)$ the inverse Φ^{-1} centered at x exists, and satsifies

$$|\Phi^{-1} - Id| \leq \frac{d^2}{r_S}, \quad |D\Phi^{-1} - Id| \leq \frac{d}{r_S}, \quad |D^2\Phi^{-1}| \leq c(n);$$

B) on $B_{r_S}^{N-1}(0) \times [-r_S, r_S]$, Φ satisfies

$$|\Phi - Id| \leq \frac{d^2 \circ \Phi}{r_S}, \quad |D\Phi - Id| \leq \frac{d \circ \Phi}{r_S}, \quad |D^2\Phi| \leq c(n).$$

The *global reflection regularity scale* of S is defined to be $r_S = \inf_{x\in S} r_S(x)$. By construction r_S scales with S, and in fact by (3) $r_S(x) = \epsilon(n) r_3(S,x)$.

We require with some further estimates on Φ. We remark that $d(x) \leq |x| + |\tilde{x}|$, where defined.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $x \in B_{r_S}(S)$, and $v \in T_x R^N$ be a unit vector. Write* refl *for the affine reflection about $T_{\zeta(x)}S$. We have*

$$|\tilde{y} - \mathrm{refl}(y)| \leq \frac{2|y-\zeta(x)|^2}{r_S} \text{ on } B_{r_S}(\zeta(x)), \quad |D_v\tilde{x} - \tilde{v}| \leq c(n)\frac{d}{r_S}, \quad |D_v D_v \tilde{x}| \leq \frac{c(n)}{r_S}.$$

For any n-plane L^n, at x we have

$$tr_L D^2|\tilde{x}|^2 = 2n \pm c(n)\left(\frac{d}{r_S} + \frac{|\tilde{x}|}{r_S}\right).$$

Proof. Use the relation

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{y} &= \Phi(\mathrm{refl}(\Phi^{-1}(y))) \\ &= \mathrm{refl}(y) + (\Phi - Id)(\mathrm{refl}(\Phi^{-1}(y))) + \mathrm{refl}((\Phi^{-1} - Id)(y)),\end{aligned}$$

and the definition of r_S. □

2.4 spacetime and flows

We define *spacetime* to be space

$$R^{N,1} = \{(x,t) : x \in R^N, t \in R\} \equiv R^{N+1},$$

endowed with the parabolic norm

$$|X| = |(x,t)| = |x| + |t|^{1/2}.$$

We typically use capitals to denote points in spacetime. We define the spacetime ball centered at X to be

$$B_R^{N,1}(X) = \{Y \in R^{N,1} : |X - Y| < R\}.$$

In $R^{N,1}$ time naturally scales like space squared. We write the parabolic scaling operator as

$$\mathcal{D}_\lambda(x,t) = (\lambda x, \lambda^2 t).$$

Given a function $u : U \subset B^{n,1}(0) \to R^{N-n}$, the *spacetime graph* of u is the set

$$\mathrm{graph}(u) = \{(u(x,t), x, t) : x \in U, t \in R\}.$$

We define the parabolic (semi-)norms

$$\begin{aligned}[u]_{\alpha,U} &= \sup_{X\neq Y \in U \cap \mathrm{dom}(u)} \frac{|u(X) - u(Y)|}{|X-Y|^\alpha}, \\ [u]_{k,\alpha,U} &= \sum_{i+2j=k} [D^i \partial_t^j u]_{\alpha,U}, \\ |u|_{k,\alpha,U} &= [u]_{k,\alpha,U} + \sum_{i+2j\leq k} |D^i\partial_t^j u|_{0,U}.\end{aligned}$$

Here $|X|$ is the parabolic norm.

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a C^∞ submanifold (with possible boundary) of R^{N+1} in the ordinary Euclidean sense, having (Euclidean) dimension $n+1$. We define the *parabolic $C^{k,\alpha}$-regularity scale* of $\mathcal{M}$ at X, written $r_{k,\alpha}(\mathcal{M}, X)$, to be the largest radius r so that, after a suitable rotation in space, the dilated and translated submanifold

$$\mathcal{D}_{1/r}(\mathcal{M} - X) \cap (B_1^{N-n} \times B_1^{n,1}) = \text{graph}(u)$$

for some $u : U \subset B_1^{n,1} \to R^{N-n}$ having $|u|_{k,\alpha,B_1^{n,1}} \leq 1$. If no such r exists we set $r_{k,\alpha} = 0$.

However if X is not a critical point for the time function $(x,t) \mapsto t$ restricted to $\mathcal{M}$, then due to the parabolic scaling $r_{k,\alpha}(\mathcal{M}, X)$ will be positive. In fact $r_{k,\alpha}$ is bounded away from 0 on compact subsets of $\mathcal{M}$, since if $r_{k,\alpha}(\mathcal{M}, X) > 0$ then one can choose an $0 < r \leq r_{k,\alpha}(\mathcal{M}, X)$ so that $r_{k,\alpha} \geq r$ in some neighborhood of X.

We say $\mathcal{M}$ is a *smooth flow with classical free-boundary* in S, if for some $T \in (-\infty, \infty]$,

A) $r_{2,\alpha}(\mathcal{M}, X) > 0$ at every $X \in \mathcal{M}$;

B) $\partial\mathcal{M} \subset (S \times (-\infty, T]) \cup \{t = T\}$, and is smooth away from $S \times \{T\}$, though $\mathcal{M}$ may have corners in $S \times \{T\}$;

C) each slice
$$\mathcal{M}(t) = \{x \in R^N : (x,t) \in \mathcal{M}\}$$
meets S orthogonally.

We often refer to $\mathcal{M}$ as the *spacetime track* of the flow. Given an open set $\mathcal{U} \subset R^{N,1}$, we say $\mathcal{M}$ is *proper* in $\mathcal{U}$ if

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}} \cap \mathcal{U} = \mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{U},$$

here $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ denoting the set-theoretic closure of $\mathcal{M}$.

We say $\mathcal{M}$ is a smooth *mean curvature flow*, with classical free-boundary in S, if it satisfies conditions A)-C), and additionally

D) the time-slices $(M_t)_t \equiv (\mathcal{M}(t))_t$ move by free-boundary mean curvature flow.

We could alternately replace D) with the more geometric condition

D') at each $X = (x,t) \in \mathcal{M}$ with $t < T$, we have
$$\text{proj}_{R^N}\left(\frac{\nabla^{\mathcal{M}} t}{|\nabla^{\mathcal{M}} t|^2}\right) = H_{\mathcal{M}(t)},$$
where $\text{proj}_{R^N}(x,t) = x$ is the spatial projection, $H_{\mathcal{M}(t)}$ is mean curvature vector of the slice, and $\nabla^{\mathcal{M}} t$ is the gradient of time in $\mathcal{M}$.

If a family of immersions $F_t : M^n \times [0,T) \to R^N$ defines a classical mean curvature flow, with free-boundary in S, then the spacetime track

$$\mathcal{M} = \{(x,t) : x \in F_t(M), t \in (0,T)\} \tag{4}$$

will be a smooth mean curvature flow in the above definition.

3 free-boundary varifolds

Fix S a smooth, embedded, oriented barrier hypersurface in R^N, with $r_S > 0$. Write ν_S for the orienting normal. We will always write V for an integral n-varifold, with $n < N$.

Definition 3.0.1. Given an open $U \subset R^N$, write $\mathcal{T}(S,U)$ for the space of vector fields $X \in C^1_c(U, R^N)$ which lie tangent to S, i.e. $X|_S \subset TS$. We abbreviate $\mathcal{T}(S) \equiv \mathcal{T}(S, R^N)$.

Definition 3.0.2. Given a Borel-measurable vector field X, define the (discontinuous) vector fields

$$S^\perp(X) = 1_S(X \cdot \nu_S)\nu_S, \quad S^T(X) = X - S^\perp(X).$$

Here ν_S is the orienting normal. Observe that $S^T(X)$ lies tangent to S, and each $S^\perp(X)$, $S^T(X)$ is Borel-measurable.

Definition 3.0.3. Let V be an integral n-varifold in $U \subset R^N$. We say V has *free-boundary in* $S \subset U$ if

$$\delta V(X) = -\int S^T(H) \cdot X d\mu_V \quad \forall X \in \mathcal{T}(S,U), \tag{5}$$

for some $S^T(H) \in L^1_{loc}(||V||, R^N)$.

As with classical free-boundary manifolds, if S is a plane then V can be reflected to a varifold without boundary.

Proposition 3.1. *Let V have free-boundary in a plane $P \subset R^N$, and write $A : R^N \to R^N$ for the reflection about P. Then the varifold $\tilde{V} = V + A_\sharp V$ satisfies*

$$\delta\tilde{V}(Y) = -\int S^T(H_V) \cdot Y d\mu_V - \int (A \circ S^T(H_V) \circ A) \cdot Y d\mu_{A_\sharp V}. \tag{6}$$

So $||\delta\tilde{V}|| \leq ||\delta V|| + ||\delta(A_\sharp V)||$, and $\tilde{V}$ has no generalized boundary.

Moreover, for any precompact W have

$$\int_W |H_{\tilde{V}}|^2 d\tilde{\mu} \leq \int_W |S^T(H_V)|^2 + |S^T(H_V) \circ A|^2 d\mu. \tag{7}$$

Proof. By direct calculation we have

$$(div_{A(L)}(Y))(A(x)) = (div_L(A \circ Y \circ A))(x).$$

Since $Y + A \circ Y \circ A \in \mathcal{T}(S)$, we therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\tilde{V}(Y) &= \delta V(Y + A \circ Y \circ A) \\ &= -\int S^T(H_V) \cdot (Y + A \circ Y \circ A) d\mu_V \\ &= -\int S^T(H_V) \cdot Y d\mu_V - \int (A \circ S^T(H_V) \circ A) \cdot Y d\mu_{A_\sharp V}.\end{aligned}$$

To deduce inequality (7), we use that for any $X \in C^1_c(W)$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int H_{\tilde{V}} \cdot X d\tilde{\mu} \\ &\leq \left(\int_W |S^T(H_V)|^2 d\mu_V\right)^{1/2} \left(\int |X|^2 d\mu_V\right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad + \left(\int_W |S^T(H_V) \circ A|^2 d\mu_{A_\sharp V}\right)^{1/2} \left(\int |X|^2 d\mu_{A_\sharp V}\right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \left(\int_W |S^T(H_V)|^2 d\mu_V + |S^T(H_V) \circ A|^2 d\mu_{A_\sharp V}\right)^{1/2} \left(\int |X|^2 d\tilde{\mu}\right)^{1/2}. \quad \square\end{aligned}$$

Any free-boundary varifold has locally bounded variation. Here is the intuition. Suppose V were smooth up to the barrier, and we have control over $S^T(H)$. Almost-everywhere in $V \cap S$ we have $T_x V \subset T_x S$, and $\mathrm{proj}_{N_x S} \circ \mathrm{II}_V = \mathrm{II}_S|_{T_x V}$. So we have control over $S^\perp(H)$ also. Then using a trace formula we obtain control over $||\partial V||$.

For general integral varifolds we accomplish this using a monotonicity formula due to Allard.

Proposition 3.2 (compare Allard [1])**.** *If V is a free-boundary varifold in U, then $||\delta V||$ is locally finite in U, and for every $W \subset\subset W' \subset\subset U$ we have*

$$||\delta V||(W) \leq c(n) \int_{W'} |S^T H| d\mu_V + c(n) \left(\frac{1}{r_S} + \frac{1}{d(W, \partial W')}\right) \mu_V(W'). \qquad (8)$$

(actually we can replace r_S with $r_2(S)$).

Therefore a locally-finite integral varifold V has free-boundary in S if and only if V has locally bounded first-variation, and the generalized boundary measure σ_V is supported in S, and $\nu_V = \nu_S$ at σ_V-a.e. x.

Proof. From the boundary monotonicity formula (see 11.1) we have that, for

any $h \in C^1_c(R^N)$,

$$\Gamma(h) := \lim_{\tau\to 0} \tau^{-1} \int_{B_\tau(S)} h|\nabla^T d|^2 d\mu_V$$
$$= r_S^{-1} \int_{B_{r_S}(S)} h|\nabla^T d|^2$$
$$- \int_{B_{r_S}(S)\sim S} (1 - d/r_S)(\nabla^T h \cdot \nabla^T d + h(tr_V D^2 d) + h(S^T H \cdot \nabla d))d\mu_V.$$

Letting g be a function satisfying:

$$0 \le g \le 1, \quad g \equiv 1 \text{ on } W, \quad \text{spt}(g) \subset W'.$$

Then using the above with $\sigma = r_S$ we have

$$|\Gamma(h)| \le |h|_0 \Gamma(g)$$
$$\le |h|_0 \left(\int_{W'} |S^T H| d\mu_V + c(n)(r_S^{-1} + d(W, \partial W')^{-1})\mu_V(W') \right). \qquad (9)$$

Given $X \in C^1_0(W, R^N)$, define in $B_{r_S}(S)$ the vector fields

$$X^{S\perp} = (X \cdot Dd)Dd, \quad X^{ST} = X - X^{S\perp},$$

and let $\eta : R_+ \to R_+$ be a function satsifying

$$\eta = 0 \text{ on } [0, \rho/2], \quad \eta = 1 \text{ on } [\rho, \infty), \quad 0 \le \eta' \le 10/\rho,$$

for $\rho < r_S$.

We calculate

$$\int div_V(X) d\mu_V = \int div_V(\eta X + (1-\eta)X^{ST} + (1-\eta)X^{S\perp}) d\mu_V$$
$$= -\int S^T(H) \cdot X d\mu_V + \int (-\eta')(X \cdot Dd)|\nabla^T d|^2 d\mu_V$$
$$+ \int (1-\eta) div_V(X^{S\perp}) d\mu_V.$$

We bound the last two terms. Taking $\rho \to 0$, we have

$$\lim_{\rho\to 0} (\text{penultimate term}) = \lim_{\rho\to 0} \rho^{-1} \int_{B_\rho(S)} (-\rho\eta'(X \cdot Dd))|\nabla^T d|^2 d\mu_V$$
$$= \pm 10 C |X|_0,$$

using (9), abbreviating the constant as simply C.

By considering a countable C^1 cover of the underlying rectifiable set, we have $T_x V \subset T_x S$ for μ_V-a.e. $x \in S$. Therefore by the dominated convergence

theorem we have

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{\rho\to 0}(\text{last term}) &= \int_S div_V((X\cdot\nu_S)\nu_S)d\mu_V \\ &= \int_S (X\cdot\nu_S)div_V(\nu_S)d\mu_V \\ &= \pm n r_S^{-1}|X|_0\mu_V(W).\end{aligned}$$

This proves equation (8).

We prove the equivalence assertion. The "if" direction is clear. Conversely, the above show $||\delta V||$ is Radon. The free-boundary condition (5) trivially shows $||\delta V|| << \mu_V$ on $R^N \sim S$, and since S is closed we have $\text{spt}(\sigma_V) \subset S$.

Given any $Y \in C_c^1(B_{r_S}(S), R^N)$, we have using the notation above

$$\begin{aligned}\delta V(Y) &= \delta V(Y^{ST} + Y^{S\perp}) \\ &= -\int H\cdot Y d\mu_V + \int \nu_S \cdot S^{\perp}(Y)d\sigma_V.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\int S^T(\nu_S)\cdot Y d\sigma_V = 0 \quad \forall Y \in C_c^1(R^N, R^N).$$

Given any $W \subset\subset R^N$ we can approximate ν_S in $L^1(W, R^N; \sigma_V)$ by $Y \in C_c^1(W, R^N)$, to deduce $S^T(\nu_S) = 0$ σ_V-a.e. □

We have the following immediate Corollary.

Corollary 3.3. *Let V_i be a sequence free-boundary varifolds with boundary in $S_i \subset U_i$. Suppose $U_i \to U$ and $\inf r_{S_i} > 0$. If*

$$\sup_i \int_W 1 + |S^T(H_i)|d\mu_{V_i} \leq C_1(W) \quad \forall W \subset\subset U,$$

then

$$\sup_i ||\delta V_i||(W) \leq D_1(W) \quad \forall W \subset\subset U.$$

Here D_1 depends only on $n, \inf r_{S_i}, C_1, W, U$.

We wish to prove a compactness Theorem for free-boundary varifolds. We require some initial approximation results.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $U \subset R^N$ be an open set. We have the following density theorems.*

A) The space $\{\phi \in C_c^\infty(U, R) : D\phi \in \mathcal{T}(S, U)\}$ is dense in $C_c^0(U, R)$.

B) If μ is Radon on U, and $1 \leq p < \infty$, then the $L^p(\mu)$ closure of $\mathcal{T}(S, U)$ is $S^T(L^p(U, R^N; \mu))$.

Proof. Part A) is clear. We prove part B). Fix an $X \in L^p(\mu)$, and choose $Y_1 \in C^1_c(U, R^N)$ so $||Y_1 - X||_{L^p(\mu)} < \epsilon$. Now choose $Y_2 \in C^1_c(S, TS)$ so that $||Y_2 - S^T(X)||_{L^p(\mu \llcorner S)} < \epsilon$. Let

$$\Lambda = \max\{|Y_1|_0, |Y_2|_0, 1\}, \quad B_R \supset \mathrm{spt} Y_1 \cup \mathrm{spt} Y_2.$$

We can pick ρ so that

$$\mu(B_R \cap (B_\rho(S) \sim S)) < \epsilon/\Lambda, \quad ||X|_{B_R \cap (B_\rho(S) \sim S)}||_{L^p(\mu)} < \epsilon.$$

Let $\tilde{Y}_1$ be a C^1_c extension of $Y_1|_{B_R \sim B_\rho(S)}$, and $\tilde{Y}_2$ a C^1_c extension of Y_2, and we can ensure

$$\max\{|\tilde{Y}_1|_0, |\tilde{Y}_2|_0\} \leq \Lambda, \quad Y_i = \tilde{Y}_i \text{ away from } B_R \cap (B_\rho(S) \sim S).$$

Then $\tilde{Y} = \tilde{Y}_1 + \tilde{Y}_2 \in \mathcal{T}(S)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} ||S^T(X) - \tilde{Y}||_{L^p(\mu)} &\leq 2\epsilon + ||X|_{B_R \cap (B_\rho(S) \sim S)}|| + ||Y_1 - \tilde{Y}_1|| + ||Y_2 - \tilde{Y}_2|| \\ &\leq 3\epsilon + 4\Lambda \cdot \mu(B_R \cap (B_\rho(S) \sim S)) \\ &\leq 10\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

This shows $\mathcal{T}(S)$ is dense in $S^T(L^p(\mu))$. Conversely, given $X \in L^p(\mu)$, then $S^T(X) = X$ iff

$$\int_{S \cap W} S \cdot \nu_S d\mu = 0 \quad \forall W \subset\subset R^N.$$

The "only if" part is trivial, and the "if" by differentation. Since the above relation is preserved under $L^p(\mu)$ limits, $S^T(L^p(\mu))$ is closed. □

Theorem 3.5. *Let V_i have free-boundary in $S_i \subset U_i$. Suppose $\inf r_{S_i} > 0$, $U_i \to U$, and $S_i \to S$ in C^3_{loc}. Suppose*

$$\sup_i \int_W 1 + |S_i^T(H_i)|^2 d\mu_{V_i} \leq C_1(W) \quad \forall W \subset\subset U.$$

Then we have an integral n-varifold V with free-boundary in $S \subset U$, and after passing to a subsequence, varifold convergence $V_i \to V$.

Further, if $X_i \in \mathcal{T}(S_i, U_i)$ converge in C^1 to $X \in \mathcal{T}(S, U)$, with uniformly bounded supports, then

$$\int H_{V_i} \cdot X_i d\mu_{V_i} \to \int H_V \cdot X d\mu_V.$$

And hence

$$\int_W |S^T(H_V)|^2 d\mu_V \leq \liminf_i \int_W |S_i^T(H_{V_i})|^2 d\mu_{V_i} \quad \forall W \subset\subset U.$$

Proof. By Holder's inequality we have uniform $L^1_{loc}(\mu_{V_i})$ bounds on $S_i^T(H_{V_i})$, and hence by Corollary 3.3 (and that r_{S_i} is uniformly bounded below) we have uniform local bounds on $||\delta V_i||$. Allard's compactness theorem implies subsequential convergence to some integral n-varifold V in U, with locally finite variation.

Fix a precompact $W \subset\subset U$. Choose any $X \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ supported in W. We can find a sequence $X_i \in \mathcal{T}(S_i)$ so that $X_i \to X$ in C^1, and $\text{spt}X_i \subset W$. We have that $\delta V_i(X_i) \to \delta V(X)$ and $\mu_{V_i}(|X_i|^2) \to \mu_V(|X|^2)$.

For each i we have

$$|\delta V_i(X_i)| \leq \left(\int_W |S_i^T(H_i)|^2 d\mu_{V_i}\right)^{1/2} \left(\int |X_i|^2 d\mu_{V_i}\right)^{1/2}.$$

Take the limit on both sides, to deduce

$$|\delta V(X)| \leq \left(\liminf_i \int_W |S_i^T(H_i)|^2 d\mu_{V_i}\right)^{1/2} \left(\int |X|^2 d\mu_V\right)^{1/2}.$$

Therefore, using Proposition 3.4, we deduce δV is an $L^2(\mu_V)$ operator on $S^T(L^2(W, R^N; \mu_V))$. So V has free-boundary in S, and

$$\int_W |S^T(H_V)|^2 d\mu_V = ||\delta V|_{\mathcal{T}(S,W)}||(W) \leq \liminf_i \int_W |S^T(H_i)|^2 d\mu_i \qquad \square.$$

4 free-boundary Brakke flows

For the duration of this paper we adopt the notation that $\tau \equiv -t$.

Definition 4.0.1. Given an open $U \subset R^N$, and an interval $I \subset R$, let $\mathcal{BT}(S, U, I)$ be the set of non-negative functions

$$\{\phi \in C^1(U \times I, R_+) : D\phi(\cdot, t) \in \mathcal{T}(S, U) \quad \forall t \in I\}$$

This is our set of admissible test functions. When there is no ambiguity we may omit the U or I.

Definition 4.0.2. Let $I \subset R$ be some interval. We say a collection $(\mu(t))_{t\in I}$ of Radon measures is an n-dimensional *Brakke flow with free-boundary in* $S \subset U$ if the following holds:

A) for a.e. $t \in I$, $\mu(t) = \mu_{V(t)}$ for some integral n-varifold $V(t)$ with free-boundary in $S \subset U$, having

$$S^T(H_{V(t)}) \in L^2_{loc}(\mu_{V(t)});$$

B) for any finite interval $(a, b) \subset I$, and every $\phi \in \mathcal{BT}(S, U, [a, b])$, we have

$$\int \phi(\cdot, b) d\mu(b) - \int \phi(\cdot, a) d\mu(a) \leq \int_a^b \int -|S^T(H)|^2\phi + S^T(H) \cdot D\phi + \partial_t \phi d\mu(t) dt. \tag{10}$$

Here I is the *time interval of definition*.

Given an domain $\Omega \subset U$, a free-boundary Brakke flow is *supported in* Ω if it additionally satisfies:

C) for a.e. t, $\mathrm{spt}\mu(t) \subset \overline{\Omega}$.

If $S = \partial\Omega \cap U$, and $(\mu(t))_t$ is supported in Ω, for short we will sometimes say $(\mu(t))_t$ is a *free-boundary Brakke flow in* $\Omega \subset U$.

Remark 4.1. Any classical mean curvature flow with boundary $(M_t^n)_t$ is a free-boundary Brakke flow, by taking $\mu(t) = \mathcal{H}^n \llcorner M_t$.

Remark 4.2. If $\phi \in \mathcal{BT} \cap C^2$, then the evolution equation (10) can be written as

$$\int \phi(\cdot, b) d\mu(b) - \int \phi(\cdot, a) d\mu(a) \leq \int_a^b \int -|S^T(H)|^2 \phi + (\partial_t - tr_V D^2)\phi d\mu(t) dt.$$

This follows from Proposition 3.2.

Further, if $\phi \in \mathcal{BT}(S, W)$ for $W \subset\subset U$, then any free-boundary Brakke flow satisfies the weaker inequality

$$\int \phi(\cdot, b) d\mu(b) - \int \phi(\cdot, a) d\mu(a) \leq \int_a^b \int -|H|^2 \phi + H \cdot D\phi + \partial_t \phi d\mu(t) dt + C(S, W, U) \int_a^b \int \phi d\mu(t) dt.$$

Actually, using Menne's C^2 covering Theorem [14] we can obtain a much sharper bound, but we will not need this.

Remark 4.3 (A remark on scaling)**.** As with smooth mean curvature flows, any (free-boundary) Brakke flow can be translated or parabolically dilated in spacetime to obtain a new Brakke flow. Precisely, if we let $\mu_{x,\lambda}$ be the rescaled measure

$$\mu_{x,\lambda}(A) = \lambda^{-n} \mu(x + \lambda A),$$

then the family

$$t \mapsto \mu_{x_0,\lambda}(\lambda^2 (t - t_0))$$

will be a Brakke flow centered at $X_0 = (x_0, t_0)$, and parabolically dilated by $1/\lambda$, with free-boundary in $S/\lambda \subset U/\lambda$.

Proposition 4.4. *Let $(\mu(t))_t$ be a Brakke flow with free-boundary in $P \subset R^N$, for some plane P, and write $A : R^N \to R^N$ for reflection about P. Then the measures $\tilde{\mu}(t) = \mu(t) + A_\sharp \mu(t)$ define a Brakke flow in R^N.*

Proof. Given any $\phi \in C^1_c(R^N, R_+)$, we have that $\phi + \phi \circ A \in \mathcal{BT}(P)$. Therefore, given any (a, b) in the time interval of definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int \phi(\cdot, b) d\tilde{\mu}(b) - \int \phi(\cdot, a) d\tilde{\mu}(a) \\
&\leq \int_a^b \int -|S^T(H)|^2 \phi + S^T(H) \cdot D\phi + \partial_t \phi \; d\mu(t) \\
&\quad + \int_a^b \int -|S^T(H) \circ A|^2 \phi + (A \circ S^T(H) \circ A) \cdot D\phi + \partial_t \phi \; d(A_\sharp \mu(t)) \\
&\leq \int_a^b \int -|\tilde{H}|^2 \phi + \tilde{H} \cdot D\phi + \partial_t \phi d\tilde{\mu}(t),
\end{aligned}$$

having used equations (6), (7). □

Analogous to smooth flows, we will often work with Brakke flows as objects in spacetime.

Definition 4.4.1. Let $(\mu(t))_t$ be a (free-boundary) Brakke flow. The *spacetime support* is the closure (in spacetime) of

$$\cup_t (\mathrm{spt}\mu(t) \times \{t\}) \subset R^{N,1},$$

taken over all times of definition. The *spacetime track* $\mathcal{M}$ of $(\mu(t))_t$ is the spacetime support with associated multiplicities.

We shall often find it convenient to identify a (free-boundary) Brakke flow with its track $\mathcal{M}$. For example:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_i \to \mathcal{M} \quad &\text{means} \quad \mu_i(t) \to \mu(t) \quad \forall t \in I \\
\mathcal{D}_{1/\lambda}(\mathcal{M} - X_0) \quad &\text{means} \quad \text{the flow dilated, translated in Remark 4.3} \\
\int_{\mathcal{M}(t)} f \quad &\text{means} \quad \int f d\mu(t) \\
\mathcal{M}(t) \quad &\text{means} \quad \mu(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.5. $\mathcal{M}$ can be more naturally thought of in terms of the pointwise Gaussian density. In fact monotonicity shows $(\mu(t))_t$ is entirely determined by its track.

In choosing an appropriate cut-off we follow Buckland [4].

Definition 4.5.1. Take the *cut-off radius* κ to be any number $\leq r_S$. Let

$$\eta(s) = (1 - s)^4_+,$$

and define the *mass cut-off function*, at radius κ, to be

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_{S,\kappa}(x, t) &= \eta\left((\kappa^2/\tau)^{3/4} \frac{|x|^2 - \alpha\tau}{\kappa^2} \right) \\
&= \left(1 - \kappa^{-2} (\kappa^2/\tau)^{3/4} (|x|^2 - \alpha\tau) \right)^4_+
\end{aligned}$$

for some $\alpha = \alpha(n) \geq 1/2$ to be determined later. Similarly, define the *reflected* cutoff function

$$\tilde{\phi}_{S,\kappa}(x,t) = \phi_{S,\kappa}(\tilde{x},t).$$

Remark 4.6. If

$$\tau \leq \kappa^2 \left((1+\alpha)\cdot 20^2\right)^{-4/3}, \tag{11}$$

then

$$\mathrm{spt}\phi_S \subset B_{\kappa/20}(0),$$

and if additionally $0 \in B_{\kappa/10}(S)$, we have by Lemma 2.3:

$$\mathrm{spt}(\phi_S + \tilde{\phi}_S) \subset B_{\kappa/2}(0). \tag{12}$$

Conversely,

$$\phi_S \geq 1/16 \text{ on } \{x : |x|^2 \leq (\tau/\kappa^2)^{3/4}\kappa^2/2\}.$$

Theorem 4.7. *For $r_S \geq \kappa$ and $t \in [-\beta_0(n)\kappa^2, 0)$, and any L^n, we have*

$$(\partial_t - tr_L D^2)\phi_{S,\kappa} \leq 0, \quad (\partial_t - tr_L D^2)\tilde{\phi}_{S,\kappa} \leq 0 \tag{13}$$

in the following scenarios:

A) $0 \in B_{\kappa/10}(S) \cap \overline{\Omega}$, $x \in \Omega$,

B) $0 \in S$, *any* x,

C) $0 \in T_{x_0}(S)$, $|x - x_0| < \frac{\kappa}{4(1+|x_0|/\rho)}$, *and* $x \notin B_\rho(0)$.

Proof. We require that $|d(x)| \leq c(n)|\tilde{x}|$. Suppose we are in case A) or B). Let y be the intersection of the line segment connecting 0 with $\tilde{x}$. Then

$$|\tilde{x}| = |\tilde{x} - y| + |y - 0| \geq d(\tilde{x}) + d(0) \geq d(x).$$

Suppose we are in scenario C). Then by Lemma 2.3 we have

$$|\tilde{x}| = |\mathrm{refl}(x)| \pm \frac{2}{r_S}|x - x_0|^2$$

where refl is the affine reflection about $T_{x_0}(S)$. Therefore

$$|x| \leq |\tilde{x}| + \frac{2}{r_S}|x - x_0|(1 + |x_0|/\rho)|x| \leq |\tilde{x}| + |x|/2.$$

This proves $d(x) \leq |x| + |\tilde{x}| \leq 3|\tilde{x}|$.

Choose $\beta_0 = \left((1+\alpha)\cdot 20^2\right)^{-4/3}$ as in Remark 4.6. We calculate, using Lemma 2.3,

$$\begin{aligned}(\partial_t - tr_L D^2)\tilde{\phi}_S &= -\eta'(\kappa^2/\tau)^{3/4}\kappa^{-2}\left(-3/4|\tilde{x}|^2/\tau - \alpha/4 + 2n \pm c(n)|\tilde{x}|/r_S\right) \\ &\leq |\eta'|(\kappa^2/\tau)^{3/2}\kappa^{-2}(-\alpha/4 + 2n \pm c(n)) \\ &\leq 0\end{aligned}$$

provided $\alpha(n)$ is sufficiently big. The case of ϕ_S follows identically. ∎

Remark 4.8. Notice that the above Definition, Remark, and Theorem are all parabolically-scale-invariant.

From the above Theorem we deduce that mass at later times is controlled by mass at earlier times.

Corollary 4.9. *Let $(\mu(t))_{t\geq 0}$ be a Brakke flow with free-boundary in $S \subset U$, and $r_S \geq \kappa$.*

There is a $\beta_1(n)$ so that for every $t \in [0, \beta_1 d(B_r(x), \partial U)^2]$, we have

$$\mu(t)(B_r(x)) \leq C(n)^{1+t/\kappa^2}\mu(0)(B_{R(t)}(x)),$$

where $R(t) \leq r + \kappa + c(n)t/\kappa$.

Proof. Suppose $0 \in S \cap B_r(x)$. Ensuring κ is sufficiently small, we have

$$\phi_{S,\kappa} + \tilde{\phi}_{S,\kappa} \in \mathcal{BT}(S, U, (-1, 0)).$$

Therefore, translating in spacetime and using Remark 4.6 and Theorem 4.7, we have

$$\mu(t+s)(B_{\gamma\kappa}(0)) \leq C(n)\mu(t)(B_{\kappa/2}(0)) \quad \forall s \in [0, \beta_0\kappa^2/2].$$

Here $\gamma = \gamma(n)$.

Suppose $0 \in B_r(x) \sim B_{\gamma\kappa}(S)$. Define

$$\varphi(x, t) = 1 - (\gamma\kappa/2)^2(|x|^2 - 2n\tau).$$

Then $(\partial_t - tr_V D^2)\varphi = 0$, and $\varphi(\cdot, 0) \geq 1/2$ on $B_{\gamma\kappa/4}(0)$, and

$$\text{spt}\varphi \subset\subset B_{\gamma\kappa}(0), \quad \varphi \leq 2 \quad \text{for } \tau \in [0, \frac{1}{4n}\gamma^2\kappa^2].$$

We deduce

$$\mu(t+s)(B_{\gamma\kappa/4}(0)) \leq 8\mu(t)(B_{\gamma\kappa}(0)) \quad \forall s \in [0, \frac{\gamma^2\kappa^2}{4n}].$$

Now apply a covering argument in spacetime. □

Corollary 4.10. *Let $(\mu(t))_{t\geq 0}$ be a Brakke flow with free-boundary in $S \subset R^N$, and $r_S \geq \kappa$. If $\text{spt}\mu(0) \subset B_R(0)$, then*

$$\text{spt}\mu(t) \subset B_{R+\kappa+c(n)t/\kappa}(0) \quad \forall t.$$

In particular, $\mu(t)$ can only move a finite distance in finite time.

Proof. Apply Corollary 4.9 to balls outside the support of μ. □

The following semi-decreasing property is crucial for (free-boundary) Brakke flows.

Theorem 4.11 (compare Theorem 7.2 in Ilmanen [9]). *Let $(\mu(t))_{t\geq -1}$ be a Brakke flow with free-boundary in $S \subset U$, satisfying*

$$\mu(t)(K) \leq C_1(K) \quad \forall t \geq -1$$

for every compact $K \subset U$.

Take $\phi \in \mathcal{BT}(S,U) \cap C^2$ independent of time. Then there is a constant $C_\phi(\phi, C_1(\mathrm{spt}\phi))$ so that

$$t \mapsto \mu(t)(\phi) - C_\phi t$$

is decreasing in t.

As a Corollary, the left-/right-limits of $\mu(t)$ exist at every $s \geq -1$, and satisfy

$$\lim_{t\to s_-} \mu(t) \geq \mu(s) \geq \lim_{t\to s_+} \mu(t).$$

We have equality outside a countable set of times.

Proof. Given any $d > c \geq -1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int \phi d\mu(d) - \int \phi d\mu(c) &\leq \int_c^d \int -|S^T(H)|^2 + S^T(H)\cdot D\phi d\mu(t)dt \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}\int_c^d \int \frac{|D\phi|^2}{\phi} d\mu(t)dt \\ &\leq C(\phi)C_1(\mathrm{spt}\phi)|d-c|.\end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 4.12. *Let $(\mu(t))_{t\geq -1}$ be a Brakke flow with free-boundary in $S \subset U$, satsifying*

$$\mu(t)(K) \leq C_1(K) \quad \forall t \geq -1$$

and every compact $K \subset U$.

Then for every compact $K \subset\subset U$, and every $b > a \geq -1$, there is a compact $K \subset \tilde{K} \subset U$, $\tilde{K} = \tilde{K}(K, |b-a|)$, and constant $D_1(K) = D_1(C_1(\tilde{K}), |b-a|)$ so that

$$\int_a^b \int_K |S^T(H)|^2 d\mu(t)dt \leq D_1(K).$$

Proof. Choose $\phi \in \mathcal{BT}(S,U) \cap C^2$, time-independent, with $\phi = 1$ on K. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\int \phi d\mu(b) - \int \phi d\mu(a) &\leq \int_a^b \int -\frac{1}{2}|S^T(H)|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\frac{|D\phi|^2}{\phi} d\mu(t)dt \\ &\leq C(\phi)C_1(\mathrm{spt}\phi) - \frac{1}{2}\int_a^b |S^T(H)|^2 d\mu(t)dt.\end{aligned}$$

□

The semi-continuity of Theorem 3.5 allows us to prove a compactness Theorem for free-boundary Brakke flows.

Theorem 4.13. *Let $(\mu_i(t))_{t\geq -1}$ be a sequence of Brakke flows with free-boundary in $S_i \subset U_i$. Let $\inf r_{S_i} > 0$, $U_i \to U$, and $S_i \to S$ in C^3_{loc}. Suppose $\mu_i(t)$ satisfy*

$$\sup_i \sup_t \mu_i(t)(K) \leq C_1(K) < \infty \quad \forall \text{ compact } K \subset U$$

Then there is a n-Brakke flow $(\mu(t))_{t\geq -1}$ with free-boundary in $S \subset U$, and a subequence i', so that

$$\mu_{i'}(t) \to \mu(t)$$

as Radon measures for every $t \geq -1$. For a.e. $t \geq -1$, there is a further subsequence i'' (depending on t), so that

$$V_{i''}(t) \to V(t)$$

as varifolds. Here $V_{i''}(t)$ and $V(t)$ are the integral n-varifolds, with free-boundary in $S_{i''}$, S (resp.), asssociated to $\mu_{i''}(t)$, $\mu(t)$ (resp.).

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a countable subset of $\{\phi \in C^2_c(U, R_+) : D\phi \in \mathcal{T}(S)\}$, which is dense in $C^0_c(U, R_+)$ (see Proposition 3.4). For any $\phi \in \mathcal{C}$, there is a constant $C_\phi = C(\phi, C_1(\text{spt}\phi))$ so that

$$L_{\phi,i}(t) = \mu_i(t)(\phi) - C_\phi t$$

is decreasing in t. We can assume $L_{\phi,i}(0) \leq C_\phi$ also.

By Helly's selection principle and a diagonalization we can pass to a subsequence, also denoted i, so that for each $\phi \in \mathcal{C}$ we have

$$L_{\phi,i}(t) \to L_\phi(t) \quad \forall t \geq -1,$$

for some decreasing function $L_\phi(t)$.

The usual compactness Theorem for Radon measures, and our choice of $\mathcal{C}$, shows that there is a collection of Radon measures $(\mu(t))_{t\geq -1}$, so that

$$\mu_i(t) \to \mu(t)$$

as measures for every $t \geq -1$.

We show $(\mu(t))_t$ is a Brakke flow with free-boundary. Fix an $-1 \leq a < b$. By Corollary 3.3, we have

$$\int_a^b \int_K 1 + |S^T(H_i)|^2 d\mu_i(t)dt \leq D_1(K)$$

for every compact $K \subset U$. If

$$f_K(t) = \liminf_i \int_K 1 + |S^T(H_i)|^2 d\mu_i(t),$$

then using Fatou we have that for a.e. $t \in (a, b)$, $f_K(t) < \infty$ for every compact $K \subset U$.

Fix a ϕ in $\mathcal{BT}(S,U)$. We can choose a sequence $\phi_i \in \mathcal{BT}(S_i,U_i)$ so that $\phi_i \to \phi$ in C^1, and $\mathrm{spt}\phi_i(\cdot,t) \subset \mathrm{spt}\phi(\cdot,t)$ for every t.

We have

$$|D\phi_i|^2 \leq |D\phi|^2 + \delta_i \cdot 1_{\mathrm{spt}\phi},$$

with $\delta_i \to 0$ as $i \to \infty$. Also, we have

$$|S^T(H_i)|^2\phi_i - H_i \cdot D\phi_i + \epsilon|S^T(H_i)|^2\phi_i + \frac{1}{2\epsilon}|D\phi_i|^2 \geq 0,$$

and

$$\int |\partial_t \phi_i| d\mu_i(t) \leq C(\phi) D_1(B_1(\mathrm{spt}\phi)).$$

Therefore, given any fixed $\epsilon, \delta > 0$, we can use Fatou to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} &\int \phi d\mu(a) - \int \phi d\mu(b) + (\epsilon + \frac{\delta}{2\epsilon}) D_1(\mathrm{spt}\phi) + \frac{1}{2\epsilon}\int_a^b \int |D\phi|^2 d\mu(t)dt \qquad (14) \\ &\geq \int_a^b \liminf_i \left(\int (1+\epsilon)|S^T(H_i)|^2\phi_i - H_i \cdot D\phi_i + \frac{1}{2\epsilon}|D\phi_i|^2 d\mu_i(t) \right) dt \\ &\quad - \int_a^b \int \partial_t \phi d\mu(t) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Write

$$M_\phi(t) = \liminf_i \int (1+\epsilon)|S^T(H_i)|^2\phi_i - H_i \cdot D\phi_i + \frac{1}{2\epsilon}|D\phi_i|^2 d\mu_i(t).$$

For a.e. $t \in (a,b)$, we can pass to a subsequence i' (depending on t) so that the following is satisfied:

A) $\mu_{i'}(t) = \mu_{V_{i'}}$ for some integral varifold $V_{i'}$, having free-boundary in $S_{i'}$;

B) $\sup_{i'} \int_K 1 + |S^T(H_{i'})|^2 d\mu_{i'}(t) < \infty$ for every compact K;

C) and

$$M_\phi(t) = \lim_{i'} \int |S^T(H_{i'})|^2\phi_{i'} - H_{i'} \cdot D\phi_{i'} + \frac{1}{2\epsilon}|D\phi_{i'}|^2 d\mu_{i'}(t).$$

By Theorem 3.5, we can pass to a further subsequence, to obtain convergece $V_{i'} \to V$ to some integral varifold, with free-boundary in S. We deduce that

$$M_\phi(t) \geq \int (1+\epsilon)|S^T(H_V)|^2\phi - H_V \cdot D\phi + \frac{1}{2\epsilon}|D\phi|^2 d\mu_V.$$

We elaborate. The second and third terms follow directly from Theorem 3.5, and the convergence of $\mu_{i'}$. To obtain the first term we use Theorem 3.5, with

a layer-cake formula:

$$\begin{aligned}\int |S^T(H_V)|^2\phi d\mu_V &= \int_0^\infty \int_{\{\phi>s\}} |S^T(H_V)|^2 d\mu_V ds \\ &\leq \int_0^\infty \liminf_{i'} \int_{\{\phi>s\}} |S^T(H_{i'})|^2 d\mu_{i'} ds \\ &\leq \liminf_{i'} \int |S^T(H_{i'})|^2 \phi d\mu_{i'} \\ &= \liminf_{i'} \int |S^T(H_{i'})|^2 \phi_{i'} d\mu_{i'}.\end{aligned}$$

However V is determined independent of the sequence i', since $\mu_i(t) \to \mu(t) = \mu_V$ independent of i'. We deduce that for a.e. $t \in (a,b)$:

A) $\mu(t) = \mu_{V(t)}$ for some integral varifold $V(t)$, having free-boundary in S,

B) and

$$M_\phi(t) \geq \int (1+\epsilon)|S^T(H_{V(t)})|^2\phi - H_{V(t)} \cdot D\phi + \frac{1}{2\epsilon}|D\phi|^2 d\mu(t).$$

Plugging this into inequality (14), we obtain:

$$\int \phi d\mu(a) - \int \phi d\mu(b) + (\epsilon + \frac{\delta}{2\epsilon}) D_1(B_1(\mathrm{spt}\phi)) \geq \int_a^b \int |S^T(H)|^2\phi - H\cdot D\phi - \partial_t\phi d\mu(t) dt,$$

for every $\epsilon, \delta > 0$. This proves the Theorem. □

Corollary 4.14. *Let $(\mu_i(t))_{t\in[a_i,b_i)}$ is a sequence of Brakke flows with free-boundary in $S_i \subset U_i$. Suppose that*

$$U_i \to R^N, \quad a_i \to a, \quad b_i \to b, \quad \inf r_{S_i} > 0, \quad S_i \to S \text{ in } C^3_{loc},$$

and

$$\sup_i \mu_i(a_i)(K) \leq C_1(K) < \infty.$$

for every compact K.

Then there is a Brakke flow $(\mu(t))_{t\in[a,b)}$ with free-boundary in $S \subset R^N$, and a subsequence i' so that $\mu_{i'}(t) \to \mu_{i'}(t)$ for every $t \in (a,b)$, and $\mu_{i'}(a_{i'}) \to \mu(a)$ if a is finite. For a.e. t there is a further subsequence i'' so that $V_{i''}(t) \to V(t)$ as in Theorem 4.13.

Proof. For each finite interval $[c,d] \subset (a,b)$ we have uniform mass bounds by Corollary 4.9, and so we can apply Theorem 4.13. The Corollary follows by diagonalization. If $a > -\infty$ we can take μ to be defined at a, as a limit of $\mu_{i'}(a_{i'})$, passing to a further subsequence as necessary. □

5 monotonicity

We prove a monotonicity for the following reflected and truncated Gaussian.

Definition 5.0.1. Define the *Gaussian heat kernel*

$$\rho_S(x,t) = (4\pi\tau)^{-n/2} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4\tau}},$$

and define the relfected heat kernel $\tilde{\rho}_S(x,t) = \rho_S(\tilde{x},t)$. Recall $\tau \equiv -t$.

Define the *reflected, truncated head kernel* to be

$$f_{S,\kappa} = \rho_S \phi_{S,\kappa} + \tilde{\rho}_S \tilde{\phi}_{S,\kappa}, \tag{15}$$

where $\phi_{S,\kappa}$, $\tilde{\phi}_{S,\kappa}$ as in Definition 4.5.1. Notice that by construction $f \in \mathcal{T}(S)$.

The above definition gives us the appropriate Gaussian density centered at the spacetime origin. Given an $X_0 = (x_0, t_0)$, define the *recentered* reflected, truncated heat kernel is the function

$$\begin{aligned} f_{S,\kappa,(x_0,t_0)}(x,t) = &\phi(x - x_0, t - t_0)\rho(x - x_0, t - t_0) \\ &+ \phi(\tilde{x} - x_0, t - t_0)\rho(\tilde{x} - x_0, t - t_0), \end{aligned}$$

so that $f_{S,\kappa,(0,0)} \equiv f_{S,\kappa}$.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $(\mu(t))_{t \geq -1}$ be a free-boundary Brakke flow in $\Omega \subset U$. Suppose $0 \in B_{\kappa/10}(S) \cap \bar{\Omega}$, and $d(0, \partial U) \geq \kappa$.*

There are $\tau_0(\kappa, n)$, $A(\kappa, n)$ so that if $\kappa \leq r_S$, then

$$t \mapsto e^{A(-t)^{1/4}} \int f_{S,\kappa} d\mu(t) + AM(-t)$$

is decreasing in $t \in [-\tau_0, 0]$. Here M is a any constant bounding

$$M \geq \mu(-\tau_0)(\phi_{S,\kappa}(\cdot, -\tau_0) + \tilde{\phi}_{S,\kappa}(\cdot, -\tau_0)).$$

Proof. In the following we write $g = O(f)$ to mean $|g| \leq c(n,\kappa)|f|$. For μ_V-a.e. x, write

$\pi^T, \pi^\perp$	for the linear pojections onto $T_xV, (T_xV)^\perp$,
$\tilde{\pi}^T, \tilde{\pi}^\perp$	for the linear pojections onto the reflected spaces $\widetilde{T_xV}, (\widetilde{T_xV})^\perp$.

Since both 0 and spt$\mathcal{M}$ lie to one side of the barrier $S = \partial\Omega$, we have $d(x) = O(|\tilde{x}|)$.

By direct computation we have

$$D_i \tilde{\rho} = \frac{- < \tilde{e}_i, \tilde{x} >}{2\tau} \tilde{\rho} + O(\frac{|\tilde{x}|^2}{\tau})\tilde{\rho},$$

and therefore

$$S^T(H_V) \cdot D\tilde{\rho} = -\frac{< \widetilde{S^T(H_V)}, \tilde{x} >}{2\tau} \tilde{\rho} + O(\frac{|\tilde{x}|^2}{\tau} |S^T(H_V)|)\tilde{\rho}.$$

We used the trivial relation $< e_i, Y >=< \tilde{e}_i, \widetilde{Y} >$.

By direct computation we have

$$\sum_i (D_i|\tilde{x}|^2)^2 = 4|\tilde{\pi}^T(\tilde{x})|^2 + O(|\tilde{x}|^2 d).$$

Also,

$$\sum_i D_i D_i |\tilde{x}|^2 = 2n + O(|\tilde{x}|).$$

Therefore we have

$$(\partial_t + trD^2)\tilde{\rho} = -\frac{|\tilde{\pi}^\perp(\tilde{x})|^2}{4\tau^2}\tilde{\rho} + O(|\tilde{x}|/\tau + |\tilde{x}|^3/\tau^2)\tilde{\rho}.$$

By a result of Brakke [3], $H_V = \pi^\perp(H_V)$ μ_V-almost everywhere. Since $T_x V \subset T_x S$ at μ_V-a.e. $x \in S$, we deduce

$$S^T(H_V) = \pi^\perp(S^T(H_V)) \quad \mu_V\text{-a.e. } x.$$

Using this and the above calculations, we have at μ_V-a.e. x:

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\partial_t + 2S^T(H_V)\cdot D + tr_V D^2)\tilde{\rho} \\
&= \left[-\frac{|\tilde{\pi}^\perp(\tilde{x})|^2}{4\tau^2} - \frac{< \tilde{\pi}^\perp(\tilde{x}), \widetilde{S^T(H_V)} >}{\tau} \right] \tilde{\rho} + O(|\tilde{x}|/\tau + |\tilde{x}|^3/\tau^2 + |S^T(H)||\tilde{x}|^2/\tau)\tilde{\rho} \\
&\leq \left[-\left| \frac{\tilde{\pi}^\perp(\tilde{x})}{2\tau} + \widetilde{S^T(H)} \right|^2 + |S^T(H)|^2 \right] \tilde{\rho} + O(|\tilde{x}|/\tau + |\tilde{x}|^3/\tau^2 + |S^T(H)||\tilde{x}|^2/\tau)\tilde{\rho}.
\end{aligned}$$

Without much rigmarole we have also

$$(\partial_t + 2S^T(H_V)\cdot D + tr_V D^2)\rho = \left[-\left| \frac{\pi^\perp(x)}{2\tau} + S^T(H) \right|^2 + |S^T(H)|^2 \right] \rho.$$

We make use of the relation

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int \phi tr_V D^2\rho - \rho tr_V D^2\phi + \tilde{\phi} tr_V D^2\tilde{\rho} - \tilde{\rho} tr_V D^2\tilde{\phi} d\mu_V \\
&= \int div(\phi D\rho - \rho D\phi) + div(\tilde{\phi} D\tilde{\rho} - \tilde{\rho} D\tilde{\phi}) d\mu_V \\
&= \int \phi H\cdot D\rho - \rho H\cdot D\phi + \tilde{\phi} H\cdot D\tilde{\rho} - \tilde{\rho} H\cdot D\tilde{\phi} d\mu_V + \int \phi D(\rho+\tilde{\rho})\cdot\nu_V + \rho D(\phi+\tilde{\phi})\cdot\nu_V d\sigma_V \\
&= \int -S^T(H)\cdot Df + 2S^T(H)\cdot(\phi D\rho + \tilde{\phi} D\tilde{\rho}) d\mu_V
\end{aligned}$$

We now calculate, using Theorem 4.7, and ensuring $\tau_0 \leq \beta_0(n)\kappa^2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\overline{D_t}\int f\,d\mu(t)\\
&\leq \int S^T(H)\cdot Df + \partial_t f - |S^T(H)|^2 f\,d\mu(t)\\
&= \int S^T(H)\cdot Df + (\partial_t\tilde{\phi})\tilde{\rho} + \tilde{\phi}(\partial_t\tilde{\rho}) + (\partial_t\phi)\rho + \phi(\partial_t\rho) - |S^T(H)|^2 f\,d\mu(t)\\
&\leq \int S^T(H)\cdot Df - 2S^T(H)\cdot(\phi D\rho + \tilde{\phi}D\tilde{\rho})\,d\mu(t)\\
&\quad + \int (tr_V D^2\tilde{\phi})\tilde{\rho} - \phi(tr_V D^2\tilde{\rho}) + (tr_V D^2\phi)\rho - \phi(tr_V D^2\rho)\,d\mu(t)\\
&\quad - \int_{M_t}\left|\frac{\tilde{\pi}^{\perp}(\tilde{x})}{2\tau} + \widetilde{S^T(H)}\right|^2\tilde{\phi}\tilde{\rho} + \left|\frac{\pi^{\perp}(x)}{2\tau} + S^T(H)\right|^2\phi\rho\,d\mu(t)\\
&\quad + C\int_{M_t}\tilde{\phi}\tilde{\rho}(|\tilde{x}|/\tau + |\tilde{x}|^3/\tau^2 + |S^T(H)||\tilde{x}|^2/\tau)\,d\mu(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Here $C = C(\kappa, n)$.

We do some subcalculations. First,

$$\begin{aligned}
&C\frac{|\tilde{x}|^2}{\tau}|\widetilde{S^T(H)}| - \left|\frac{\tilde{\pi}^{\perp}(\tilde{x})}{2\tau} + \widetilde{S^T(H)}\right|^2\\
&\leq C\frac{|\tilde{x}|^2}{\tau}\left(\left|\frac{\tilde{\pi}^{\perp}(\tilde{x})}{2\tau} + \widetilde{S^T(H)}\right| + \frac{|\tilde{x}|}{2\tau}\right) - \left|\frac{\tilde{\pi}^{\perp}(\tilde{x})}{2\tau} + \widetilde{S^T(H)}\right|^2\\
&\leq C\frac{|\tilde{x}|^3}{\tau^2} + C^2\frac{|\tilde{x}|^4}{\tau^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Second, we have for $\alpha > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\rho}\frac{|\tilde{x}|}{\tau} &\leq 1 + \left(\tilde{\rho}\frac{|\tilde{x}|}{\tau}\right)^{\alpha}\\
&= 1 + c\tau^{\frac{n\alpha}{2}-\frac{\alpha}{2}}\left(e^{-\frac{|\tilde{x}|^2}{4\tau}}\frac{|\tilde{x}|}{2\sqrt{\tau}}\right)^{\alpha}\\
&\leq 1 + C(\alpha)\tau^{-\frac{n\alpha}{2}-\frac{\alpha}{2}+\frac{n}{2}}\tilde{\rho}\\
&= 1 + C(\alpha)\tau^{\frac{n}{2}(1-\alpha)-\frac{\alpha}{2}}\tilde{\rho}.
\end{aligned}$$

We used that, for any $\beta, \gamma > 0$, that $y^{\beta}e^{-y} \leq C(\beta,\gamma)(e^{-y})^{1-\gamma}$. Keep in mind that $C(\alpha) \to \infty$ as $\alpha \to 1$. Precisely the same calculation holds for $|\tilde{x}|^3/\tau^2$, since the relative powers again differ by $1/2$.

Third, observe in the previous calculation that we can arrange so that the exponent

$$\frac{n}{2}(1-\alpha) - \frac{\alpha}{2} = -3/4,$$

by taking $\alpha = 1 + 1/(2+2n) > 1$.

We put the three calculations together, to deduce:

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{D_t}\int f\,d\mu(t) &\le C\int \tilde{\phi}\tilde{\rho}(\frac{|\tilde{x}|}{\tau}+\frac{|\tilde{x}|^3}{\tau^2})\,d\mu(t)\\ &\le C\tau^{-3/4}\int f + C\int \phi+\tilde{\phi}\,d\mu(t)\\ &\le C\tau^{-3/4}\int f + C\int \phi+\tilde{\phi}\,d\mu(-\tau_0)\\ &\le C\tau^{-3/4}\int f + AM. \end{aligned}$$ □

Using the above we define a Gaussian density in a neighborhood of the barrier. For points outside this neighborhood we can use the standard truncated Gaussian density, and by our one-sidedness assumption these will be compatible across the transition region.

Definition 5.1.1. Let $\mathcal{M} \equiv (\mu(t))_{t\ge -1}$ be a free-boundary Brakke flow in $\Omega \subset U$. For $t_0 > -1$, and $x_0 \in \overline{\Omega}$, define the *reflected Gaussian density* of $\mathcal{M}$ at $X_0 = (x_0, t_0)$ as follows.

For κ, r satisfying:

$$\kappa \le \min\{r_S, d(x_0, \partial U)\}, \quad r^2 \le \min\{\tau_0(n,\kappa), t_0+1\},$$

we set

$$\begin{aligned}&\Theta_{refl(S,\kappa)}(\mathcal{M}, X_0, r)\\ &= \begin{cases} \int f_{S,\kappa,X_0}(x, t_0-r^2)d\mu(t_0-r^2)(x) & x_0 \in B_{\kappa/10}(S)\cap\bar{\Omega}\\ \int \phi(x-x_0,-r^2)\rho(x-x_0,-r^2)d\mu(t_0-r^2)(x) & x_0 \in \bar{\Omega}\sim B_{\kappa/10}(S).\end{cases}.\end{aligned}$$

For shorthand we write $\Theta_{refl(S)} := \Theta_{refl(S,r_S)}$ where appropriate.

Remark 5.2. By Remark 4.6, and our one-sidedness assumption, the two cases agree near $\partial B_{\kappa/10}(S)\cap\bar{\Omega}$ provided τ_0 is sufficiently small (depending only on n, κ).

Remark 5.3. Θ_{refl} is parabolic scale-invariant, in the sense that

$$\Theta_{refl(S/\lambda,\kappa/\lambda)}(\mathcal{D}_{1/\lambda}\mathcal{M}, 0, R) = \Theta_{refl(S,\kappa)}(\mathcal{M}, 0, \lambda R). \tag{16}$$

Remark 5.4. If S is a plane, then $\Theta_{refl(S,\kappa)}$ is the standard truncated Gaussian density of the reflected flow.

In this new notation, Theorem 5.1 implies

Theorem 5.5. *Let $\mathcal{M} \equiv (\mu(t))_{t\ge -1}$ be a free-boundary Brakke flow in $\Omega \subset U$. For any $x_0 \in \bar{\Omega}$, $t_0 > -1$, and $\kappa \le \min\{r_S, d(x_0,\partial U)\}$, we have that*

$$r \mapsto Ae^{\sqrt{r}}\Theta_{refl(S,\kappa)}(\mathcal{M}, X_0, r) + AMr^2$$

is increasing in $r \in [0, \min(\sqrt{\tau_0}, \sqrt{1+t_0})]$. *Here* M *is any constant bounding*

$$M \geq \mu(\min(t_0 - \tau_0, -1))(B_{\kappa/2}(x_0)).$$

In particular, the limit

$$\Theta_{refl(S,\kappa)}(\mathcal{M}, X_0) := \lim_{r\to 0} \Theta_{refl(S,\kappa)}(\mathcal{M}, X_0, r)$$

exists and is finite, for every $t_0 > -1$.

Proof. For x_0 near the barrier this is immediate from Theorem 5.1. Away from the barrier, Θ is actually monotone in r without error terms, by the computations of Theorem 5.1. □

Remark 5.6. In the following section we will show this limit is indepedent of (admissible) choice of κ.

6 tangent flows

We prove the existence of tangent flows, as self-similar Brakke flows with free-boundary in a plane, and show that the Gaussian density of the reflected tangent flow agrees with the original reflected density at the point. Throughout this section we take $\mathcal{M} \equiv (\mu(t))_{t\geq -1}$ to be a free-boundary Brakke flow in $\Omega \subset U$, and (as usual) write $S = \partial\Omega$.

Lemma 6.1. *For any* $r > 0$, *and* $\tau \in (0, 1]$, *then provided* λ *is sufficiently small, we have*

$$(\mathcal{D}_{1/\lambda}\mathcal{M})(-\tau)(B_r(0)) \leq C(r, \tau, \kappa, n)\Theta_{refl(S,\kappa)}(\mathcal{M}, 0),$$

provided $\kappa \leq \min\{r_S, d(0, \partial U)\}$.

Proof. By Remark 4.6 for λ small we have $\phi_{S/\lambda,\kappa/\lambda}(x, -\tau) \geq 1/16$ on $B_r(0)$.

Therefore, provided $\lambda \leq \lambda_0(\mathcal{M}, \kappa, n)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2\Theta_{refl(S,\kappa)}(\mathcal{M}, 0) &\geq \Theta_{refl(S/\lambda,\kappa/\lambda)}(\mathcal{D}_{1/\lambda}\mathcal{M}, 0, \sqrt{\tau}) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{16}(4\pi\tau)^{-n/2} \int_{(\mathcal{D}_{1/\lambda}\mathcal{M})(-\tau)\cap B_r} e^{-|x|^2/4\tau} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{c(r,\tau,n)} ||(\mathcal{D}_{1/\lambda}\mathcal{M})(-\tau)||(B_r). \end{aligned}$$ □

Since S/λ converges in C^3_{loc} to a plane as $\lambda \to 0$, we have by Corollary 4.14:

Proposition 6.2. *Let* $x_0 \in \overline{\Omega}$, $t_0 > -1$, *and* $\lambda_i \to 0$. *Write* $X_0 = (x_0, t_0)$.

After passing to a subsequence, there is an ancient $\mathcal{M}'$ *so that*

$$\mathcal{D}_{1/\lambda_i}(\mathcal{M} - X_0) \to \mathcal{M}'.$$

Here $\mathcal{M}'$ *is either a Brakke flow in* R^N *(if* $x_0 \notin S$*), or a free-boundary Brakke flow in some half-space in* R^N *(if* $x_0 \in S$*).*

If $\mathcal{M}'$ *has free-boundary it can be reflected to obtain a Brakke flow* $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}'$ *in* R^N *(without boundary). Otherwise simply let* $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}' = \mathcal{M}'$.

We show that $\mathcal{M}'$ moves by self-shrinking.

Lemma 6.3. *For any Λ, and $\tau \in (0, \tau_0/2)$, and $\kappa \leq \min\{r_S, d(0, \partial U)\}$, we have*

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}(-\tau)\cap\{|x|^2\geq\Lambda\tau\}} f(x,-\tau) \leq c(M,\kappa,n)e^{-\Lambda/8}$$

where M is any bound on $\mu(-\tau_0/2)(B_{\kappa/2}(0))$, and $r_S \geq \kappa$. In particular, M is independent of τ and Λ.

Proof. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_{S,\kappa}(x,-\tau) &= \left(1-\kappa^{-2+3/2}|x|^2/\tau^{3/4}+\alpha\kappa^{-2+3/2}\tau^{1-3/4}\right)_+^4\\ &\leq \left(1-\kappa^{-2+3/2}|x|^2/(2\tau)^{3/4}+\alpha\kappa^{-2+3/2}(2\tau)^{1-3/4}\right)_+^4\\ &= \phi_{S,\kappa}(x,-2\tau).\end{aligned}$$

And similarly for $\tilde{\phi}$.

Therefore provided $\tau \leq \tau_0/2$ we can use the monotonicity formula centered at $(0,\tau)$ to deduce

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathcal{M}(-\tau)\cap\{|x|^2\geq\Lambda\tau\}} f_{S,\kappa}(x,-\tau)\\ &\leq e^{-\Lambda/8}2^{m/2}\int_{\mathcal{M}(-\tau)} f_{S,\kappa,(0,\tau)}(x,-\tau)\\ &\leq e^{-\Lambda/8}2^{m/2}\left[e^{A\tau_0^{1/4}}\int_{\mathcal{M}(-\tau_0/2)} f_{S,\kappa,(0,\tau)}(x,-\tau_0/2)+AM\tau_0\right]\\ &\leq e^{-\Lambda/8}C(\kappa,n,M).\end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 6.4. *The (reflected) Brakke flow $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}'$ from Proposition 6.2 is an ancient self-shrinker, having density*

$$\Theta(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}') = \Theta_{refl(S,\kappa)}(\mathcal{M}, X_0)$$

for any admissible κ.

Corollary 6.5. *The pointwise density $\Theta_{refl(S,\kappa)}(\mathcal{M}, X)$ is indepedent of κ.*

Proof of Theorem. We can suppose $X_0 = 0$. Take $\mathcal{M}_i = \mathcal{D}_{1/\lambda_i}\mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}'$ as above, and $\kappa \leq \min\{r_S, d(0,\partial U)\}$. Let refl be reflection about the limit barrier plane if it exists, and formally ∞ if it does not. By the dominated convergence theorem we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathcal{M}'(-\tau_0)\cap B_R} \tau_0^{-m/2}\left(e^{-|x|^2/4\tau_0}+e^{-|\mathrm{refl}(x)|^2/4\tau_0}\right)\\ &= \lim_i \int_{\mathcal{M}_i(-\tau_0)\cap B_R} f_{S/\lambda_i,\kappa/\lambda_i}(x,-\tau_0)\\ &= \lim_i \int_{\mathcal{M}(-\lambda_i^2\tau_0)\cap B_{\lambda_i R}} f_{S,\kappa}(x,-\lambda_i^2\tau_0)\end{aligned}$$

Writing $\tau \equiv \lambda_i^2 \tau_0$, we have

$$B_{\lambda_i R} = \{x : |x| \leq \lambda_i R = \frac{R}{\sqrt{\tau_0}}\sqrt{\tau}\}$$
$$= \{x : |x|^2 \leq \frac{R^2}{\tau_0}\tau\}.$$

So every term in the limiting sequence is of the form

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}(-\tau)\cap\{|x|^2 \leq \frac{R^2}{\tau_0}\tau\}} f_{S,\kappa}(x, -\tau)$$

By the Lemma 6.3 we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}'(-\tau_0)\cap B_R} \tau_0^{-m/2} \left(e^{-|x|^2/4\tau_0} + e^{-|\mathrm{refl}(x)|^2/4\tau_0}\right) = \Theta_{refl(S)}(\mathcal{M}, 0) \pm \epsilon$$

where $\epsilon \to 0$ as $R \to \infty$. By the monotone convergence theorem the LHS converges to the standard Gaussian density of the reflected Brakke flow $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}'$. The above equality holds for every τ_0, so $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}'$ has constant density.

By the standard monotonicity formula ([8]) we deduce $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}'$ is a self-shrinker. □

The above Theorem and Corollary motivate the following definitions.

Definition 6.5.1. The *reflected Guassian density at a point* is

$$\Theta_{refl(S)}(\mathcal{M}, X) = \lim_{r\to 0} \Theta_{refl(S,\kappa)}(\mathcal{M}, X, r),$$

where κ is any number $\leq \min\{r_S, d(x, \partial U)\}$.

Definition 6.5.2. Given $x \in S$, a *reflected tangent flow* at $X = (x, t)$ is the flow $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}'$ obtained by reflecting a tangent flow $\mathcal{M}'$ at X about its free-boundary planar barrier.

Any reflected tangent flow of $\mathcal{M}$ at X will have constant Gaussian density equal to $\Theta_{refl(S)}(\mathcal{M}, X)$.

We will need the following Proposition. It should be standard.

Proposition 6.6. *Let $\mathcal{M} \equiv (\mu(t))_{t\leq 0}$ be an ancient, self-shrinking Brakke flow in R^N with $\Theta(\mathcal{M}) < \infty$, and write $\mu(-1) = \mu_V$.*

Let V' be a tangent cone to V at x (since V is minimal in a weighted metric, we can take tangent cones at every point). Then we have

$$\Theta_{eucl}(V') = \Theta(\mathcal{M}, (x, -1)) \leq \Theta(\mathcal{M}).$$

Proof. Let $\lambda_i \to 0$ be chosen so that $(V - x)/\lambda_i \to V'$ as varifolds (where we interpret translation and dilation in the obvious sense of pushforwards). By passing to a further subsequence, we can assume $\mathcal{D}_{1/\lambda_i}(\mathcal{M} - (x, -1)) \to \mathcal{M}'$.

Since $\mathcal{M}$ is self-shrinking, $\mathcal{M}'$ must be a static, eternal flow with $\mathcal{M}'(t) \equiv \mu_{V'}$. We calculate, using the coarea formula and standard formulas for ω_n,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Theta(\mathcal{M}, (x,-1)) &= \Theta(\mathcal{M}') \\
&= \Theta(\mathcal{M}', 0, 1) \\
&= (4\pi)^{-n/2} \int_{\mathcal{M}'(-1)} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4}} \\
&= ||V' \cap \partial B_1|| (4\pi)^{-n/2} \int_0^\infty r^{n-1} e^{-r^2/4} dr \\
&= \Theta_{eucl}(V').
\end{aligned}$$

By $V' \cap \partial B_1$ we refer to the "slice" of the underlying rectifiable set. □

7 upper-semi-continuity

The reduction of Θ_{refl} to the reflected Gaussian in the case of planar barriers, and the above monotonicity result, give good behavior in limits.

Lemma 7.1. *Let $\mathcal{M}_i$ be a sequence of Brakke flows in $\Omega_i \subset U_i$, so that (writing $S_i = \partial\Omega_i$) $\inf_i r_{S_i} \geq \kappa > 0$. Assume that*

$$\limsup_i \Theta_{refl(S_i)}(\mathcal{M}_i, X_i, r_i) \leq \Theta_0$$

for every $X_i \to 0$, $r_i \to 0$, subject to $r_i \leq R_i$ for some sequence R_i.

Let $\lambda_i \to \infty$ be another sequence, with $\lambda_i R_i \to \infty$, and suppose the dilated flows $\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_i}\mathcal{M}_i$ converge to some Brakke flow $\mathcal{M}'$ in R^N, having possible free-boundary in a plane.

If $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}'$ is the reflection of $\mathcal{M}'$ across its barrier plane, then we have

$$\Theta(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}', X, r) \leq \Theta_0 \quad \forall X, r.$$

Proof. Fix an $X_0 = (x_0, t_0)$, r, R. By assumption we have a (possibly empty) affine plane P so that $\lambda_i S_i \to P$ in C^3_{loc}. Let refl be the affine reflection about P if it exists, and formally ∞ if it does not.

We have by the dominated convergence theorem:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathcal{M}'(t_0 - r^2) \cap B_R} r^{-m} (e^{-|x-x_0|^2/4r^2} + e^{-|\mathrm{refl}(x)-x_0|^2/4r^2}) \\
&= \lim_i \int_{(\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_i}\mathcal{M}_i)(t_0-r^2)\cap B_R} f_{\lambda_i S_i, \lambda_i \kappa, X_0}(x, t_0 - r^2) \\
&\leq \limsup_i \Theta_{refl(\lambda_i S_i)}(\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_i}\mathcal{M}_i, X_0, r) \\
&= \limsup_i \Theta_{refl(S_i)}(\mathcal{M}_i, \mathcal{D}_{1/\lambda_i} X_0, r/\lambda_i) \\
&\leq \Theta_0
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality is justified because of the requirement $\lambda_i R_i \to \infty$.

Taking $R \to \infty$, we have by the monotone convergence therem that

$$\Theta(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}', X_0, r) \leq \Theta_0. \qquad \square$$

Lemma 7.2. *Let $\mathcal{M}_i$ be a sequence of free-boundary Brakke flows in $\Omega_i \subset U_i$. Suppose*

$$\inf r_{S_i} \geq \kappa > 0, \quad U_i \to U, \quad \Omega_i \to \Omega \text{ in } C^3_{loc},$$

and $\mathcal{M}_i \to \mathcal{M}$ for some free-boundary Brakke flow in $\Omega \subset U$.

Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is defined for times > -1. Take $X = (x,t)$ with $t > -1$. Then for every $X_i \to X$, $r_i \to 0$, we have

$$\limsup_i \Theta_{refl(S_i,\kappa)}(\mathcal{M}_i, X_i, r_i) \leq \Theta_{refl(S)}(\mathcal{M}, X).$$

Proof. We can assume $X_i = X = 0$ by translating the $\mathcal{M}_i$, $\mathcal{M}$ in spacetime. Then $\mathcal{M}$ is defined for time $\geq T_0$ for some $T_0 < 0$. We can therefore assume the $\mathcal{M}_i$ are defined for time $\geq T_0/2$.

Let $\tau_1 = \min(-T_0/4, \tau_0)$. Since $\mathcal{M}_i \to \mathcal{M}$, we can choose a uniform M with

$$M \geq ||\mathcal{M}_i(-\tau_1)||(B_{\kappa/2}(0)) \quad \forall i, \quad M \geq ||\mathcal{M}(-\tau_1)||(B_{\kappa/2}(0)).$$

Then for every $r^2 \leq \tau_1$, we have by the dominated convergence theorem and Theorem 5.5

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_i \Theta_{refl(S_i,\kappa)}(\mathcal{M}_i, 0, r_i) &= \limsup_i e^{A\sqrt{r_i}} \Theta_{refl(S_i,\kappa)}(\mathcal{M}_i, 0, r_i) + AMr_i^2 \\
&\leq \limsup_i e^{A\sqrt{r}} \Theta_{refl(S_i,\kappa)}(\mathcal{M}_i, 0, r) + AMr^2 \\
&= e^{Ar^{2/4}} \Theta_{refl(S,\kappa)}(\mathcal{M}, 0, r) + AMr^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Now take $r \to 0$. $\square$

We therefore have upper-semi-continuity of density.

Corollary 7.3. *In the notation of the above Lemma, we have also*

$$\limsup_i \Theta_{refl(S_i)}(\mathcal{M}_i, X_i) \leq \Theta_{refl(S)}(\mathcal{M}, X).$$

Corollary 7.4. *In the notation of the above Lemma, we have that*

$$\mathrm{spt}\mathcal{M} = \{\Theta_{refl(S)}(\mathcal{M}, \cdot) \geq 1\} \text{ in } U \times (-1, \infty) \subset R^{N,1},$$

and $\mathrm{spt}\mathcal{M}_i \to \mathrm{spt}\mathcal{M}$ *in the local Hausdorff sense in* $U \times (-1, \infty)$.

Proof. To prove the first claim it will suffice to show $\Theta_{refl} \geq 1$ on a dense subset of $\mathrm{spt}\mathcal{M}$.

For a.e. $t \geq -1$, $\mathcal{M}(t) = \mu_{V(t)}$ for some integral varifold $V(t)$. Then for $\mu_{V(t)}$-a.e. x, $\mu_{V(t)}$ has a tangent plane. Pick any (x,t) satisfying these two conditions.

Let $\mathcal{M}'$ be a tangent flow of $\mathcal{M}$ at (x,t). Then $\mathcal{M}'(0) = k\mathcal{H}^n \llcorner P$ for some n-plane P. By Proposition 6.6, we deduce

$$1 \leq k \leq \Theta(\mathcal{M}') = \Theta_{refl(S)}(\mathcal{M}, (x,t)).$$

This proves the first claim. The second now follows the first, and upper semi-continuity of density. □

8 local regularity

We prove an a priori regularity estimate for classical flows, as in White [20].

Theorem 8.1. *For any $0 < \alpha < 1$, and $\kappa > 0$, there are $\epsilon(n, N, \kappa, \alpha)$, $C(n, N, \kappa, \alpha)$ so that the following holds:*

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a smooth n-dimensional mean curvature flow in $\Omega \subset U$, with (classical) free-boundary in $S = \partial\Omega \cap U$, with $r_{3,\alpha}(S) \geq \kappa$. Suppose for some open $\mathcal{U} \subset U \times R \subset R^{N,1}$, $\mathcal{M}$ is proper in $\mathcal{U}$, and

$$\Theta_{refl(S)}(\mathcal{M}, X, r) < 1 + \epsilon, \quad \forall X \in \mathcal{U},\ 0 < r < d(X, \partial\mathcal{U}), \tag{17}$$

then

$$r_{2,\alpha}(\mathcal{M}, X)^{-1} d(X, \partial\mathcal{U}) \leq C. \tag{18}$$

Remark 8.2. If we assume $r_{\ell+1,\alpha}(S) \geq \kappa$, then the same proof verbatim bounds the $r_{\ell,\alpha}$-regularity scale of $\mathcal{M}$. In this case ϵ, C may depend on ℓ.

Proof. We follow White. Let $\bar{\epsilon}$ be the infimum over all $\epsilon > 0$ for which the Theorem fails. We wish to show $\bar{\epsilon} > 0$.

We have a sequence of numbers $\epsilon_i \to \epsilon$, so that for each i there is a smooth mean curvature flow $\mathcal{M}_i$, supported in some smooth domain Ω_i, having classical free-boundary in $S_i = \partial\Omega_i \cap U_i$, and proper in some open $\mathcal{U}_i \subset U_i \times R \subset R^{N,1}$. This sequence satisfies:

A) $r_{3,\alpha}(S) \geq \kappa$,

B) $\Theta_{refl(S_i)}(\mathcal{M}_i, X, r) < 1 + \epsilon_i$ for every $X \in \mathcal{U}_i$, and $0 < r < d(X, \partial\mathcal{U}_i)$,

C) $\sup_{X \in \mathcal{U}_i} r_{2,\alpha}(\mathcal{M}_i, X)^{-1} d(X, \partial\mathcal{U}_i) \to \infty$.

By shrinking the $\mathcal{U}_i$ as necssary, we can assume that the quantity C) is finite for each i, and that every $\mathcal{U}_i$ is bounded.

Choose X_i so that

$$r_{2,\alpha}(\mathcal{M}_i, X_i)^{-1} d(X_i, \partial\mathcal{U}_i) \geq \frac{1}{2} \sup_{\mathcal{U}_i} r_{2,\alpha}(\mathcal{M}_i, \cdot)^{-1} d(\cdot, \partial\mathcal{U}_i),$$

and set

$$\lambda_i = r_{2,\alpha}(\mathcal{M}_i, X_i)^{-1}.$$

Define the rescaled sequence

$$\mathcal{M}_i' = \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_i}(\mathcal{M}_i - X_i), \quad \Omega_i' = \lambda_i(\Omega_i - x_i), \quad \mathcal{U}_i' = \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_i}(\mathcal{U}_i - x_i).$$

Then each $\mathcal{M}_i'$ satisfies the hypothesis of the Theorem, with Ω_i', $\mathcal{U}_i'$, and ϵ_i, but additionally

$$r_{2,\alpha}(\mathcal{M}_i', 0) = 1.$$

By our choice of λ_i we have

$$d(0, \partial\mathcal{U}_i') = \lambda_i d(X_i, \partial\mathcal{U}_i) \to \infty,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} r_{2,\alpha}(\mathcal{M}_i', \cdot)^{-1} &\leq \frac{2d(0, \partial\mathcal{U}_i')}{d(X_i, \partial\mathcal{U}_i')} \\ &\leq \frac{2d(0, \partial\mathcal{U}_i')}{d(0, \partial\mathcal{U}_i') - |X_i|} \\ &\to 2 \quad \text{uniformly on compact sets,} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$r_{3,\alpha}(S_i') \geq \lambda_i \kappa \to \infty.$$

Therefore, after passing to a subsequence, the $\mathcal{M}_i'$ converge locally in C^2 to some C^2 mean curvature flow $\mathcal{M}'$, which is proper in $R^{N,1}$. The limit $\mathcal{M}'$ either has no boundary, or is supported in a half-space Ω, with free-boundary in a plane $P = \partial\Omega$. In the latter case we have $\Omega_i \to \Omega$ in $C^{3,\alpha}_{loc}$.

Let $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}'$ be the Brakke flow without boundary obtained by reflecting $\mathcal{M}'$ about P if it exists (Proposition 4.4), or simply $\mathcal{M}'$ if P does not. In fact $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}'$ is entirely smooth (Proposition 12.1), though we will not need this.

By Lemma 7.1, we have

$$\Theta(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}', X, r) \leq 1 + \bar{\epsilon}, \quad \forall X,\ r.$$

Suppose, towards a contradiction, that $\bar{\epsilon} = 0$. Then by the standard monotonicity formula we must have (after a suitable rotation in space)

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}' = \{0\}^{N-n} \times R^n \times (-\infty, T],$$

for some possibly infinite $T \geq 0$.

Therefore on any compact set and i large we have

$$r_2(\mathcal{M}_i', \cdot)^{-1} \to 0, \quad r_{2,\alpha}(\mathcal{M}_i', \cdot)^{-1} \leq 3,$$

and so after a suitable rotation,

$$\mathcal{M}_i' \cap (B_5^{N-n} \times B_5^n \times (-\infty, T_i]) \subset \text{graph}(u_i)$$

where u_i is defined on $B_5^{n,1} \cap (Q_i \times (-\infty, T_i])$, for some smooth domain Q_i (a perturbation of $\Omega_i \cap (R^n \times \{0\})$), and some $T_i \geq 0$ converging to T.

The u_i satisfy

$$|u_i|_{2,B_5^{n,1}} \to 0, \quad [u_i]_{2,\alpha,B_5^{n,1}} \leq c(n,\alpha). \tag{19}$$

We wish to show that

$$[u_i]_{2,\alpha,B_2^{n,1}} \to 0,$$

which will contradict our normalization $r_{2,\alpha}(\mathcal{M}_i', 0) = 1$.

If P lies outside $B_5^{N-n} \times B_5^n$, then the proof reduces to the boundaryless case considered by White. We shall therefore assume

$$S_i \cap (B_5^n \times B_5^{N-n}) \neq \emptyset$$

for all i large.

Let Φ_i be the map (2) straightening out the barrier surface S_i, centered at any point in $S_i \cap (B_5^{N-n} \times B_5^n)$. By equations (3) we have that

$$|\Phi_i^{-1} - Id| \to 0, \quad |D\Phi_i^{-1} - Id| \to 0, \quad [\Phi_i^{-1}]_{2,\alpha} \to 0 \tag{20}$$

uniformly on compact sets.

So using Lemma 10.2, we have $\Phi_i^{-1}(\text{graph}(u_i)) = \text{graph}(\tilde{u}_i)$, where

$$\tilde{u}_i(x,t) = u_i(x + \xi(x,t), t) + \eta(x,t) \tag{21}$$

is defined on some half-ball $B_4^{n,1} \times (\text{half-space} \times (-\infty, T_i])$, with standard Neumann boundary conditions. The ξ, η satisfy estimates

$$|\xi|_{2,\alpha,B_4^{n,1}} \to 0, \quad |\eta|_{2,\alpha,B_4^{n,1}} \to 0. \tag{22}$$

It will therefore suffice to show that

$$[\tilde{u}_i]_{2,\alpha,B_3^{n,1}} \to 0.$$

Each $\tilde{u}_i$ satisfies the graphical mean curvature flow equation in the pullback metric $\gamma_i = \Phi_i^* \delta$:

$$\partial_t \tilde{u}_i - g^{pq} D_{pq} \tilde{u}_i = 0,$$

where g^{pq} is the inverse of the matrix $g_{pq} = \gamma_i(e_p + D_p \tilde{u}_i, e_q + D_q \tilde{u}_i)$. From relations (20), (19), (22) and standard Holder relations (30), (31), we have

$$[\delta^{pq} - g^{pq}]_{0,\alpha,B_{7/2}^{n,1}} \to 0.$$

Therefore by the parabolic Schauder estimates with Neumann boundary conditions (e.g. Theorem 4.23 in [12]), we deduce $[\tilde{u}_i]_{2,\alpha,B_3^{n,1}} \to 0$. This gives the required contradiction. □

Corollary 8.3 (White [20])**.** *Let $\bar{\epsilon} > 0$ be as in the proof of Theorem 8.1. Then:*

A) If $\mathcal{M}'$ is a proper, smooth mean curvature flow in R^N, with $\Theta(\mathcal{M}') < 1 + \bar{\epsilon}$, then $\mathcal{M}'$ is flat.

B) There is a non-flat, proper, smooth mean curvature flow $\mathcal{M}$ in R^N with $\Theta(\mathcal{M}) = 1 + \bar{\epsilon}$.

C) The ϵ of Theorem 8.1 depends only on n, N, even for estimates on $r_{\ell,\alpha}$.

Remark 8.4. The constant C of Theorem 8.1 may still depend on κ, α, ℓ.

Proof. The proof is in White [20]. Since it is very short we reproduce it here.

For A), one can check easily (Proposition 12.2) that for every $X = (x, t)$ and r, with $t \leq 0$, we have

$$\Theta(\mathcal{M}', X, r) \leq \Theta(\mathcal{M}').$$

Therefore if $\Theta(\mathcal{M}') < 1 + \bar{\epsilon}$, we can apply Theorem 8.1 to

$$\mathcal{M}'' = \mathcal{M}' \cap \{t \leq 0\}$$

to deduce

$$r_{2,\alpha}(\mathcal{M}'', X)^{-1} d(X, \partial B_R^{N,1}) \leq C$$

for every R and X. Therefore $\mathcal{M}''$ is flat, and so is $\mathcal{M}'$.

The flow of B) is simply the smooth, proper limit flow obtained in the proof of Theorem 8.1 C) is immediate from the existence of $\mathcal{M}$ of B). □

Corollary 8.5 (Brakke [3], White [20])**.** *There is an $\eta(n, N) \leq \bar{\epsilon}$ so that if $\mathcal{M}$ is a self-shrinking Brakke flow in R^N, having $\Theta(\mathcal{M}) < 1 + \eta$, then $\mathcal{M}$ is flat.*

Proof. Take $1 + \eta$ the lesser of $1 + \bar{\epsilon}$ (of Corollary 8.3), and the least density of any non-flat minimal n-cone in R^N (which is > 1 by Allard [1]).

Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is a self-shrinker in R^N having density $\Theta(\mathcal{M}) < 1 + \eta$, and write $\mathcal{M}(-1) = \mu_V$. Recall that V is minimal in a weighted metric. So at each point the Euclidean density exists, and by Proposition 6.6 must satisfy $\Theta_{eucl} < 1 + \eta$. By Allard's Theorem and our choice of η, $\mathcal{M}(-1)$ must be completely smooth.

We can therefore apply Corollary 8.3 part A) to the smooth, proper flow $\mathcal{M} \cap \{t \leq -1\}$ to deduce $\mathcal{M}$ is flat. □

Remark 8.6. The least density is attained either by the flow of Corollary 8.3 part B), or by the static least density minimal cone.

Theorem 8.1 implies a Brakke regularity Theorem for smooth flows, and limits of smooth flow. We require some defininitions.

Definition 8.6.1. Let $\mathcal{S}(n, N)$ be the collection of n-Brakke flows $\mathcal{M}$ in R^N with free-boundary satisfying:

A) $\mathcal{M}$ is supported inside some smooth domain $\Omega \subset R^N$, and has free-boundary in $\partial\Omega$,

B) $r_{3,\alpha}(\partial\Omega) > 0$.

Definition 8.6.2. Given a free-boundary Brakke flow $\mathcal{M}$, we say a point X is a *regular point* of $\mathcal{M}$ if in some spacetime neighborhood of X, spt$\mathcal{M}$ coincides with smooth, proper mean curvature flow with classical free-boundary.

Definition 8.6.3. Let $\mathcal{M}_i$, $\mathcal{M}$ be a sequence of Brakke flows in $\mathcal{S}(n,N)$, supported in Ω_i, Ω, with free-boundary in $\partial\Omega_i$, $\partial\Omega$. We say $\mathcal{M}_i \to \mathcal{M}$ *as Brakke flows with free-boundary* if the following holds:

A) $\inf r_{3,\alpha}(\partial\Omega_i) > 0$, for some fixed $0 < \alpha < 1$,

B) $\Omega_i \to \Omega$ in $C^{3,\alpha}_{loc}$,

C) if I_i, I are the time-domains of definition for $\mathcal{M}_i$, $\mathcal{M}$, then $I_i \to I$, and for each t in the interior of I, $\mathcal{M}_i(t) \to \mathcal{M}(t)$ as Radon measures.

Theorem 8.7. *Let*

$$\mathcal{D}(n,N) = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{S}(n,N), \text{ such that if any (reflected) tangent flow at } X \text{ is a} \\ \text{multiplicity-1 (quasi-)static plane, then } X \text{ is a regular point.} \end{array} \right\}.$$

Then $\mathcal{D}$ is closed under convergence of free-boundary Brakke flows.

Further, there is an $\eta(n,N)$ so that if $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{D}$ has free-boundary in $\partial\Omega$, and $\Theta_{refl(\partial\Omega)}(\mathcal{M}, X) < 1 + \eta$, then X is a regular point.

Remark 8.8. By definition, any smooth, proper mean curvature flow (with classical free-boundary) lies in $\mathcal{D}$.

Proof. The second assertion is immediate from Corollary 8.5: If $\Theta_{refl(\partial\Omega)}(\mathcal{M}, X) < 1 + \eta$, then any (reflected) tangent flow $\mathcal{M}'$ at X must satisfy $\Theta(\mathcal{M}') < 1 + \eta$ also (Theorem 6.4). Choosing η as in Corollary 8.5, we must have that $\mathcal{M}'$ is flat.

We prove the first assertion. Let $\mathcal{M}_i \in \mathcal{D}$ be a sequence converging to some $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{S}$. Suppose $\Theta_{refl(\partial\Omega)}(\mathcal{M}, 0) = 1$.

We wish to show there is an open set $\mathcal{U}$, and an i_0, so that

$$\Theta_{refl(\partial\Omega_i,\kappa)}(\mathcal{M}_i, X, r) < 1 + \eta \quad \forall i > i_0, \quad \forall X \in \mathcal{U}, \quad \forall r < d(X_i, \partial\mathcal{U}). \quad (23)$$

Here $\kappa > 0$ is chosen so that $\kappa < \inf_i r_{3,\alpha}(\partial\Omega_i)$, where Ω_i is the domain supporting $\mathcal{M}_i$.

Suppose, towards a contradiction, (23) fails. Then (passing to a subsequence as necessary) we have a a sequence $R_i \to 0$, and $X_i \in \cap B^{N,1}_{R_i}(0)$, so that

$$\Theta_{refl(\partial\Omega_i,\kappa)}(\mathcal{M}_i, X_i, R_i) \geq 1 + \eta.$$

But then since $X_i \to 0$, $R_i \to 0$, this contradicts upper semi-continuity (Lemma 7.2). Therefore (23) must hold for some domain $\mathcal{U}$.

We deduce that (for i large) $\mathcal{M}_i \cap \mathcal{U}$ is regular, and satisfies the conditions of Theorem 8.1. So we have an a priori estimate of the form

$$\sup_{\mathcal{U}} r_{2,\alpha}(\mathcal{M}_i, \cdot)^{-1} d(\cdot, \partial\mathcal{U}) \leq C,$$

independent of i. By Proposition 10.3 0 is a regular point of $\mathcal{M}$. □

Corollary 8.9. *Let $F : M^n \times [0,T) \to \overline{\Omega} \subset R^N$ be a smooth mean curvature flow, with classical free-boundary in $S = \partial\Omega$. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be free-boundary Brakke flow induced by F.*

If for any x we have $\Theta_{refl(S)}(\mathcal{M}, (x,T)) < 1 + \eta$, then (x,T) is a regular point of $\mathcal{M}$. In other words, F extends smoothly up to time T near x.

Proof. Choose a increasing sequence $T_i \to T$. Each flow

$$\mathcal{M}_i = \mathcal{M} \cap \{t \leq T_i\}$$

is smooth, proper, and hence $\mathcal{M}_i \in \mathcal{D}(n,N)$. Further, it is clear that $\mathcal{M}_i \to \mathcal{M}$ as free-boundary Brakke flows. By Theorem 8.7, $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{D}(n,N)$ also. Therefore, by assumption, spt$\mathcal{M}$ is smooth near (x,T). □

9 elliptic regularization

We adapt the elliptic regularization construction of Ilmanen [9] to the free-boundary setting. All the real work here is Ilmanen's or White's, we merely verify the constructions work with our notion of free-boundary Brakke flow.

Throughout this section we will assume $\Omega \subset R^N$ is a domain with smooth boundary $S = \partial\Omega$, satisfying $r_{3,\alpha}(S) > 0$; and Σ is an integral n-current in Ω, with finite mass, compact support, and satisfying additionally $\mathcal{H}^{n+1}(\text{spt}\Sigma) = 0$.

The main result of this section is the following.

Theorem 9.1 (an adaption of Ilmanen [9])**.** *Then there is a Brakke flow $\mathcal{M} \equiv (\mu(t))_{t\geq 0}$ in Ω with free-boundary in $\partial\Omega$, so that*

A) $\mathcal{M}(0) = \Sigma$ as varifolds,

B) $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{D}(n,N)$, where $\mathcal{D}$ as in Theorem 8.7,

C) there is an integral $(n+1)$-current T in $\Omega \times [0,\infty)$ satisfying:

i) $\partial T = \Sigma$,

ii) $||T \llcorner (\Omega \times B)|| \leq c(|B| + |B|^{1/2})$ for any interval B,

iii) $\mu(t) \geq \mu_{\partial(T \llcorner \Omega \times (t,\infty))}$ for every t.

(Ilmanen calls $\mathcal{M}$ satisfying condition C) an "enhanced motion").

Further, if Σ is smooth, embedded, with classical free-boundary in $\partial\Omega$, then for some $\delta(\Sigma) > 0$, $\mathcal{M} \cap \{0 \leq t \leq \delta\}$ is smooth and proper.

From the uniqueness of classical solutions we obtain directly

Corollary 9.2. *If Σ is smooth, then the flow $\mathcal{M}$ of Theorem 9.1 coincides with any classical free-boundary mean curvature flow as long as it exists.*

Define the functional

$$I_\epsilon(P) = \frac{1}{\epsilon}\int e^{-z/\epsilon} d\mu_P$$

on the space of integral $(n+1)$-currents in R^{N+1}. Here z is the R component of $R^N \times R$. Recall that I_ϵ is the area function for the metric

$$g = e^{\frac{-2z}{(n+1)\epsilon}}\delta_{eucl}.$$

In this metric, every plane $\{z = const\}$ is strictly convex, with mean curvature pointing in the ∂_z direction.

Definition 9.2.1. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the space of integral $(n+1)$-currents P in $\Omega \times R$, for which $\partial P = \Sigma$ and $\mathrm{spt}P \subset \Omega \times [0, \infty)$.

Clearly $\mathcal{C}$ is closed under weak convergence. If P_i is a minimizing sequence for I_ϵ, then since we have local mass bounds we can take a limit $P_i \to P_\epsilon$. Then $P_\epsilon \in \mathcal{C}$ also, and by lower-semi-continuity of mass P_ϵ minimizes I_ϵ in $\mathcal{C}$.

Moreover, we have that

$$\mu_{P_\epsilon}(\Omega \times \{0\}) = 0. \tag{24}$$

This follows by White's varifold maximum principle [21], the strict convexity of the $\{z = 0\}$ plane, and our assumption that $\mathcal{H}^{n+1}(\mathrm{spt}\Sigma) = 0$.

P_ϵ can be extended to an integer-multiplicity rectifiable current in R^{N+1} by restriction. The extension will satisfy

$$\mu_{P_\epsilon} = \mu_{P_\epsilon} \llcorner (\Omega \times R),$$

though in general the boundary will not a priori be anymore integral. That said, Gruter [6] has shown that for minimizers such as P_ϵ the extension boundary is integral and locally finite, but we will not need this fact.

Here's what will happen. We define the translating solitons $P_\epsilon(t) = P_\epsilon - t/\epsilon$. As $\epsilon \to 0$, these "stretch out" to become a z-invariant Brakke flow, with initial condition $\Sigma \times (0, \infty)$. This gives the required Brakke flow.

On the other hand, we can normalize P_ϵ by scaling z by $1/\epsilon$. As $\epsilon \to 0$, the normalized currents T_ϵ essentially approach the spacetime track of the Brakke flow obtained previously. In fact the limit will sit beneath the spacetime track. For reasons intimately connected with non-uniquess, there may be a mass descrepency between the spacetime track and the limit.

Proposition 9.3. *Let P_ϵ minimize I_ϵ in $\mathcal{C}$. Then as an integral varifold P_ϵ has locally bounded variation in $R^N \times (0, \infty)$, and satisfies*

$$S^T(H_{P_\epsilon}) = -\partial_z^\perp/\epsilon \quad \mu_{P_\epsilon} - a.e. x \in R^N \times (0, \infty). \tag{25}$$

Proof. The relation (25) follows directly from the fact that

$$\delta I_\epsilon(P_\epsilon)(X) = 0 \quad \forall X \in \mathcal{T}(\partial\Omega, R^N \times (0, \infty)).$$

The locally finite variation is a consequence of Proposition 3.2. □

Write $\sigma_s(x,z) := (x, z+s)$, and define the varifolds

$$P_\epsilon(t) := (\sigma_{-t/\epsilon})_\sharp P_\epsilon.$$

Then Proposition 9.3 shows the associated Radon measures

$$t \in [0,\infty) \mapsto \mu_\epsilon(t) := \mu_{P_\epsilon(t)}$$

form a Brakke flow in $\Omega \times (0,\infty)$ with free-boundary in $\partial\Omega \times (0,\infty)$.

Given an open interval $A \subset R$, let us write $P_\epsilon(A) = P_\epsilon \llcorner (R^N \times A)$.

Proposition 9.4 (Ilmanen section 4)**.** *Let P_ϵ minimize I_ϵ in $\mathcal{C}$. Then*

A) we have $I_\epsilon(P_\epsilon) \leq ||\Sigma||$;

B) for any interval $A \subset R$,

$$\frac{1}{|A|}\int |\partial_z^T|^2 d\mu_{P_\epsilon(A)} \leq I_\epsilon(P_\epsilon);$$

C) we have

$$\frac{1}{\epsilon}\int |\partial_z^\perp|^2 d\mu_{P_\epsilon} \leq I_\epsilon(P_\epsilon);$$

D) in particular, for any interval $A \subset R$, we have $||P_\epsilon(A)|| \leq (|A|+\epsilon)||\Sigma||$.

Proof. The proof is identical to that in Ilmanen, since all the relevant vector fields lie in $\mathcal{T}(\partial\Omega \times R, R^N \times (0,\infty))$. We provide an overview. Part A) follows by plugging in $\Sigma \times [0,\infty)$ into I_ϵ.

To prove B)-D), first one proves: for any $\delta > 0$, and $w - \delta \geq z \geq 0$, we have

$$\delta^{-1}\int |\partial_z^T|^2 d\mu_{P_\epsilon(z,z+\delta)} - \delta^{-1}\int |\partial_z^T|^2 d\mu_{P_\epsilon(w,w+\delta)} \geq \epsilon^{-1}\int |\partial_z^\perp|^2 d\mu_{P_\epsilon(z+\epsilon,w)}. \tag{26}$$

To achieve this plug the vector field $X = \eta(z)e^{z/\epsilon}\partial_z$ into $\delta I_\epsilon(P_\epsilon)$, for η an appropriate piece-wise linear function supported on $(0,\infty)$.

Similarly, one can prove that: for any $\delta > 0$ we have

$$\delta^{-1}\int |\partial_z^T|^2 d\mu_{P_\epsilon(0,\delta)} \leq I_\epsilon(P_\epsilon). \tag{27}$$

One uses a family of vector fields $X = \phi(z)\partial_z$, where ϕ looks like:

$$\phi(z) = z/\delta \quad \text{ on } [0,\delta], \quad \phi(z) = 1 - (z-\delta)/L \quad \text{ on } [\delta, L].$$

These vector fields are allowed because we know by Corollary 4.9 that $P_\epsilon(0,a)$ is compactly supported for any $a < \infty$.

By (24) we need only prove B), C) for intervals $A \subset (0,\infty)$. B) follows directly from (26), (27), and choosing an appropriate partition of A. C) follows from (26), (27), and the monotone convergence Theorem. D) is then immediate. □

Theorem 9.5. *There is a sequence $\mu_i \equiv \mu_{\epsilon_i}$ so that $\mu_i \to \mu$ as free-boundary Brakke flows. Here $t \in [0,\infty) \mapsto \mu(t)$ is a free-boundary Brakke flow in $\Omega \times (0,\infty)$, with*

$$\mu(t)(R^N \times A) \leq |A|||\Sigma|| \quad \forall t \in [0,\infty), \text{ intervals } A \subset R.$$

From this point on we shall fix μ and μ_i as in this Theorem.

Proof. Proposition 9.4 shows the masses $\mu_\epsilon(0)$ are uniformly locally bounded in ϵ. The existence of μ follows from the compactness Theorem 4.13. The bounds follow from lower-semi-continuity of mass, because

$$\mu_\epsilon(t)(R^N \times A) = ||P_\epsilon||(A + t/\epsilon) \leq (|A| + \epsilon)||\Sigma||. \qquad \square$$

Proposition 9.6 (Ilmanen 8.5/8.8)**.** *The flow μ satisfies:*

A) For a.e. $t \geq 0$, we have that

$$\mu(t) = \mu_{V(t)} = \mu_{W(t)\times R},$$

where $V(t)$, $W(t)$ are integral $(n+1)$- and n-varifolds respectivly.

B) If $\theta \in C_c((0,\infty), R)$ satisfies $\int \theta = 1$, then

$$W(t)(\psi(x,S)) = V(t)(\psi(x, S \oplus \langle \partial_z \rangle)\theta(z)), \quad \mu_{W(t)}(\phi(x)) = \mu_{V(t)}(\phi(x)\theta(z)).$$

C) The collection $t \in [0,\infty) \mapsto \bar{\mu}(t) \equiv \mu_{W(t)}$ defines a free-boundary Brakke flow in Ω.

D) We have

$$\bar{\mu}(t)(R^N) \leq ||\Sigma|| \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Proof. Follows directly as in Ilmanen [9] 8.5 and 8.8, using Theorem 4.11 to prove z-invariance. Conclusions A), B) implies the free-boundary condition on $\bar{\mu}(t)$. $\square$

We set $\mathcal{M}$ to be the flow $\bar{\mu}$. We've already established $\mathcal{M}$ is an integral, free-boundary Brakke flow in Ω. We wish to show $\mathcal{M}(0) = \mu_\Sigma$.

Let $\kappa_\epsilon(x,z) := (x, \epsilon z)$, and define

$$T_\epsilon := (\kappa_\epsilon)_\sharp P_\epsilon.$$

Then by precisely the same computation of Ilmanen [9] Section 8.10, for any open interval $A \subset R$,

$$||T_\epsilon(A)|| \leq (|A| + \epsilon^2)^{1/2}(1 + |A|^{1/2}) I_\epsilon(P_\epsilon).$$

Here $T_\epsilon(A) := T_\epsilon \llcorner (R^N \times A)$.

We can pass to a subsequence (WLOG ϵ_i also), so that $T_i \equiv T_{\epsilon_i} \to T$ as currents in $\Omega \times R$. Here T is an integral $(n+1)$-current supported in $\Omega \times [0, \infty)$, with $\partial T = \Sigma$, and

$$\mu_T(R^N \times A) \leq |A|^{1/2}(1 + |A|^{1/2})||\Sigma|| \quad \forall \text{ intervals } A \subset R.$$

The family of currents $t \mapsto \partial T(t, \infty)$ is 1/2-Holder continuous in the flat-norm.

In particular, one obtains

Lemma 9.7. *If $\delta_i \to 0$, then $T_{\epsilon_i}(t + \delta_i, \infty) \to T(t, \infty)$.*

The following Proposition and Corollary finishes the proof of Theorem 9.1 parts A), C).

Proposition 9.8. *For every $t \geq 0$, we have $\bar{\mu}(t) \geq \mu_{\partial T(t,\infty)}$. Note we are taking the boundary of $T(t, \infty)$ as a current in $\Omega \times R$.*

Proof. Using test functions $\phi \in C_c^2(\Omega, R_+)$, the computation in Ilmanen 8.11 shows $\bar{\mu}(t) \llcorner \Omega \geq \mu_{\partial T(t,\infty)}$. But since T is taken as a current in $\Omega \times R$ we have $\mu_{\partial T(t,\infty)}(\partial\Omega \times R) = 0$. □

Corollary 9.9. *We have $\lim_{t \to 0^+} \bar{\mu}(t) = \bar{\mu}(0) = \mu_\Sigma$.*

Proof. The previous Proposition shows $\bar{\mu}(0) \geq \mu_\Sigma$. Since $\bar{\mu}(0)(R^N) \leq ||\Sigma||$, we must have equality.

By Theorem 4.11 we know

$$\mu_\Sigma = \bar{\mu}(0) \geq \lim_{t \to 0^+} \bar{\mu}(t). \tag{28}$$

But since the mass $||\partial T(t, \infty)||$ is continuous in t, we have

$$||\Sigma|| = \lim_{t \to 0} \mu_{\partial T(t,\infty)}(R^N) \leq \lim_{t \to 0} \bar{\mu}(t)(R^N) \leq ||\Sigma||.$$

We therefore we must have equality in (28). □

We prove Theorem part B).

Lemma 9.10. *For any $x \in \overline{\Omega} \times (0, \infty)$, we have*

$$\Theta_{refl(\partial\Omega \times R)}(\mu_\epsilon, (x, 0)) = \Theta_{eucl}(P_\epsilon, x).$$

And consequently, $\mu_\epsilon \in \mathcal{D}(n + 1, N + 1)$.

Proof. One readily verifies that since the flow μ_ϵ moves by translation, any tangent flow $\mathcal{M}'$ at $(x, 0)$ is a static cone V, where V is some tangent cone of P_ϵ at x. Then by Theorem 6.4 and Proposition 6.6 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Theta_{eucl}(P_\epsilon, x) &= \Theta_{eucl}(V) \\
&= \Theta(\mathcal{M}') \\
&= \begin{cases} \Theta_{refl(\partial\Omega \times R)}(\mu_\epsilon, (x, 0)) & x \in \Omega \times R \\ \frac{1}{2}\Theta_{refl(\partial\Omega \times R)}(\mu_\epsilon, (x, 0)) & x \in \partial\Omega \times R \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

If some (reflected) tangent flow of μ_ϵ at (x,t) is a multiplicity-1 (quasi-)static plane, then by Allard [1] (if $x \in \Omega \times R$) or Gruter-Jost [7] (if $x \in \partial\Omega \times R$), the above shows that P_ϵ is regular at $x + (0, t/\epsilon)$. This proves $\mu_\epsilon \in \mathcal{D}(n+1, N+1)$. □

The $\mu_i(t)$ converge to $\mu(t)$ as free-boundary Brakke flows. Therefore by Theorem 8.7, $\mu(t) \in \mathcal{D}(n+1, N+1)$ also. By Proposition 9.6 it clearly follows that $\mathcal{M} \equiv \bar{\mu} \in \mathcal{D}(n, N)$.

9.11 smooth initial data

Let $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{D}(n, N)$ be a free-boundary Brakke flow in Ω (write $S = \partial\Omega$), with smooth initial data $\mathcal{M}(0) = \Sigma$. We do not actually require $\mathcal{M}$ to arise from elliptic regularization. The key arguments in this section are due to White.

Lemma 9.12. *Take $x \in \Sigma$, and let $L = \{0\}^{N-n} \times T_x\Sigma \times R \subset R^{N,1}$. For any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $r = r(x, \epsilon)$ so that*

$$\mathcal{M} \cap (B_r^{N,1}(x,0) \cap \{t > 0\}) = \text{graph}(u),$$

for some smooth $u : \Omega \subset L \to L^\perp$, which satisfies

$$|u|/\sqrt{t} + |Du| + |D^2u|\sqrt{t} + |\partial_t u|\sqrt{t} \leq \epsilon. \tag{29}$$

Proof. Suppose there is a sequence of points $Y_i = (y_i, t_i) \in \mathcal{M}$, with $y_i \to x$, $t_i \to 0$, satisfying for each i one of the following:

A) Y_i is not a regular point,

B) the projection proj_L restricted to $\mathcal{M}$ is not a local diffeomorphism at Y_i,

C) $\mathcal{M} = \text{graph}(u)$ near Y_i, but $|Du| + |D^2u|\sqrt{t_i} + |\partial_t u|\sqrt{t_i} \geq \epsilon$.

We can of course assume a single condition fails for all i.

Consider the dilated flows

$$\mathcal{M}_i = \mathcal{D}_{1/\sqrt{t_i}}(\mathcal{M} - (y_i, 0)).$$

Notice condition C) is parabolic-scale-invariant.

Pass to a subsequence and obtain convergence $\mathcal{M}_i \to \mathcal{M}'$. Since $\mathcal{M}_i(0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_i}}(\Sigma - y_i)$ converges to $T_x\Sigma$ in C^1_{loc}, we must have that $\mathcal{M}'$ is a static multiplicity-1 plane. If $x \in S$ then $\mathcal{M}'$ has free-boundary in a plane.

This implies that $\limsup_i \Theta_{refl(S)}(\mathcal{M}_i, X) = 1$ for any $X \in R^N \times (0, \infty)$. Therefore by Theorem 8.7, $\mathcal{M}_i$ is regular at any such X for i sufficiently large.

Theorem 8.1 implies the $r_{2,\alpha}(\mathcal{M}_i)$ is uniformly bounded on compact subsets of $r_{2,\alpha}$. Passing to a further subsequence as necessary, and using Proposition 10.3, we obtain smooth convergence $\mathcal{M}_i \to \mathcal{M}'$ in $\mathcal{U}$.

In particular, for i sufficiently large, we must have that

$$\mathcal{M}_i \cap (B_2^N(0) \times [-1/4, 4]) = \text{graph}(u_i)$$

for $u_i : \Omega_i \subset L \to L^\perp$ satsifying

$$|Du_i| + |D^2 u_i| + |\partial_t u_i| \to 0$$

as $i \to \infty$.

But by construction we have $\tilde{Y}_i = \mathcal{D}_{1/\sqrt{t_i}} Y_i = (0,1)$. So $\tilde{Y}_i \in B_2^N(0) \times [-1/4, 4]$ is eventually graphical, with estimates (29), contradicting our intial choice.

This shows that near x, $\mathcal{M} \cap \{0 < t\}$ splits as a union of graphs over L, each with estimate (29). But by repeating the same blow-up argument with the dilates $\mathcal{D}_{1/\sqrt{t_i}}(\mathcal{M} - x)$, we deduce $\mathcal{M}$ must be one-sheeted. □

This shows that for some $\delta(\Sigma)$, $\mathcal{M}$ is regular on $\{0 < t \leq \delta\}$, is $C^{0,1}$ (in spacetime) and C^1 (in space) up to $t = 0$. This argument by itself is not sufficient to prove C^∞ up to $t = 0$, since it only requires Σ to be C^1.

We prove using a barrier argument that $\mathcal{M}$ is $C^{1,1}$ up to $t = 0$. Parabolic Schauder estimates will then give us C^∞ (or, in general, as much regularity as Σ).

Choose κ smaller than $r_S/30$ and 1/30-th the $C^{1,1}$ regularity scale of Σ. Given any $x \in \Sigma$, and unit vector v in the normal bundle $N_x\Sigma$, we can attach a small ball $B_{x,v}$ of radius κ passing through x and having outward normal vector $-v$.

If $x \in B_{r_S/10}(\partial\Omega)$, then by the free-boundary condition

$$\tilde{B}_{x,v} = \{\tilde{x} : x \in B_{x,v}\}$$

is either disjoint from Σ (if $x \notin \partial\Sigma$), or touches tangentially at x also (if $x \in \partial\Sigma$). We wish to apply Theorem 4.7, to deduce that for short time $t \in [0, t_0(n,\kappa)]$, Σ stays disjoint from the ball $B_{x,v}(t)$ obtained by shrinking $B_{x,v}$ by the factor $1 - c(n,\kappa)t$.

To do this we may require a little extra work. Let y be the center of $B_{x,v}$. If $y \in \overline{\Omega}$ we simply apply Theorem 4.7 condition A). Otherwise, we must apply Theorem 4.7 condition B) to a small ball (and its reflection) centered at $\zeta(y)$, to ensure Σ stays disjoint from a neighborhood of y. Then we are justified in applying Theorem 4.7 condition C) to deduce the requied disjointness.

If $x \notin B_{r_S/10}(\partial\Omega)$, then by considering the evolution of just $\phi(x,t)$ from Theorem 4.7 we obtain the same conclusion.

In either case we deduce u as in Lemma 9.12 satisfies the improved estimate

$$|u|/t + |Du|/\sqrt{t} + |D^2 u| + |\partial_t u| \leq 1$$

in a sufficiently small spacetime neighborhood of x. This shows $\mathcal{M}$ extends as in $C^{1,1}$ to time 0, and therefore completes the proof of Theorem 9.1.

10 appendix: straightening the barrier

We show explicitly how the errors (in space) from straightening the barrier tranfer to errors in spacetime. This is in principle standard but the spacetime nature of the perturbation makes it a little more confusing.

Recall the interpolation inequality: if $i' + 2j' \leq \ell$, then

$$r^{i'+2j'} |D^{i'} \partial_t^{j'} u|_{0, B_r^{n,1}} \leq r^{\ell+\alpha} [u]_{\ell,\alpha, B_r^{n,1}} + |u|_{0, B_r^{n,1}}.$$

So to control the $C^{\ell,\alpha}$ spacetime norm of u in $B_r^{n,1}$, it suffices to control the top Holder semi-norms and the C^0 norm. Of course the same kind of interpolation inequality holds for the standard Holder spaces. We will make use of this fact repeatedly and implicitly.

The following are useful identities:

$$\begin{aligned} [f \circ g]_{\alpha, B_r^n} &\leq [f]_{\alpha, g(B_r^n)} |Dg|^{\alpha}_{0, B_r} \\ [f \circ g]_{\alpha, B_r^n} &\leq |Df|_{0, g(B_r)} [g]_{\alpha, B_r^n} \\ [f_1 \cdots f_k]_{\alpha, U} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} [f_i]_{\alpha, U} \prod_{j \neq i} |f_j|_{0, U} \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Similarly, the spacetime Holder semi-norms satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} [f \circ g]_{\alpha, B_r^{n,1}} &\leq [f]_{\alpha, g(B_r^{n,1})} (|Dg|_{0, B_r} + r|\partial_t g|_{0, B_r})^{\alpha} \\ [f \circ g]_{\alpha, B_r^{n,1}} &\leq (|Df|_{0, g(B_r)} + r|\partial_t f|_{0, g(B_r)}) [g]_{\alpha, B_r^{n,1}}. \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

We recall an elementary fact.

Lemma 10.1. *Let $f : B_r^n \to R^n$ be a C^1 map with*

$$r^{-1}|f - Id| + |Df - Id| \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0(n)$$

Then f is invertible, with

$$r^{-1}|f^{-1} - Id| + |Df^{-1} - Id| \leq c(n)\epsilon.$$

If f is C^ℓ, with $\sum_{i=2}^{\ell} r^{i-1}|D^i f| \leq B$, then

$$r^{\ell-1}|D^\ell f^{-1}| \leq c(n, \ell)(B + B^\ell).$$

If we additionally know that $r^{\ell+\alpha-1}[D^\ell f]_\alpha \leq B$, then

$$r^{\ell+\alpha-1}[D^\ell f^{-1}]_\alpha \leq c(n, \ell)(B + B^\ell).$$

This can be taken as either the regular or spacetime Holder semi-norm (if $f \equiv f(\cdot, t)$).

The following is inspired by Simon's "squash Lemma."

Lemma 10.2. *Let $u : U \subset B_r^{n,1} \to R^{N-n}$ be C^1 in both variables, with*

$$r^{-1}|u| + |Du| + r|\partial_t u| \leq 1.$$

Suppose $\phi : B_{3r}^N \to R^N$ satisfies

$$\phi = Id + e, \quad r^{-1}|e| + |De| \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_1(n).$$

Then (extending ϕ to act on $R^{N,1}$) we have $\phi(\text{graph}(u)) = \text{graph}(\tilde{u})$, where

$$\tilde{u}(y,t) = u(y + \xi(y,t), t) + \eta(y,t),$$

with the estimates

$$r^{-1}|\xi| + |D\xi| + r|\partial_t \xi| \le c(n)\epsilon, \quad r^{-1}|\eta| + |D\eta| + r|\partial_t \eta| \le c(n)\epsilon.$$

If further we have

$$r^{\ell+\alpha-1}[e]_{\ell,\alpha,B_r^n} \le \epsilon, \quad r^{\ell+\alpha-1}[u]_{\ell,\alpha,B_r^{n,1}} \le 1,$$

Then

$$r^{\ell+\alpha-1}[\xi]_{\ell,\alpha,B_{r/2}^{n,1}} \le c(n,\ell,\alpha)\epsilon, \quad r^{\ell+\alpha-1}[\eta]_{\ell,\alpha,B_{r/2}^{n,1}} \le c(n,\alpha,\ell)\epsilon.$$

Proof. We have

$$\phi(x, u(x,t)) = (x + e_1(x, u(x,t)), u(x) + e_2(x, u(x,t))).$$

Write $A(x,t) = x + e_1(x, u(x,t))$. We have trivially that

$$r^{-1}|A - Id| \le \epsilon, \quad |DA - Id| \le |De_1|(1 + |Du|) \le c(n)\epsilon.$$

Further, we calculate

$$r|\partial_t A| \le r|De_1||\partial_t u| \le c(n)\epsilon.$$

By the inverse function therem an inverse $A_t^{-1} \equiv A(\cdot,t)^{-1}$ exists for each time slice. Therefore we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{u}(y,t) &= u(A_t^{-1}(y), t) + e_2(A_t^{-1}(y), u(A_t^{-1}(y,t))) \\ &=: u(y + \xi(y,t), t) + \eta(y,t)\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\xi(y,t) = y - A_t^{-1}(y), \quad \eta(y,t) = e_2(A_t^{-1}(y), u(A_t^{-1}(y), t)).$$

We work towards the estimates on ξ and η. First we bound A^{-1}. We immediately obtain

$$r^{-1}|A^{-1} - Id| \le c(n)\epsilon, \quad |DA^{-1} - Id| \le c(n)\epsilon$$

from Lemma 10.1.

Let us consider higher derivatives. We calculate, for any any $m + \ell/2 \ge 1$, that

$$D^\ell \partial_t^m A = \sum D^\alpha e_1|_{(x,u(x,t))} \star D^{\beta_1}\partial_t^{\gamma_1}(id,u) \star \cdots \star D^{\beta_p}\partial_t^{\gamma_p}(id,u)$$

We sum over $\alpha \ge 1$, $\beta_i, \gamma_i \ge 0$, with $\beta_i + \gamma_i \ge 1$, subject to

$$m - 1 = \sum(\gamma_i - 1)_+ \quad \text{and} \quad \ell = \alpha + \sum(\beta_i - 1)_+.$$

Given $(x,t),(y,s) \in B_r^{n,1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|e_1(x,u(x,t)) - e_1(y,u(y,s))| &\le [e_1]_{\alpha,B_r^n}(|x-y| + |u(x,t)-u(y,s)|)^\alpha \\ &\le [e_1]_{\alpha,B_r^n}(|x-y| + |Du||x-y| + r|\partial_t u||s-t|^{1/2})^\alpha \\ &\le c(n,\alpha)[e_1]_{\alpha,B_r^n}||(x,t)-(y,s)||^\alpha.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$[e_1(x,u(x,t))]_{\alpha,B_{r/2}^{n,1}} \le c(n,\alpha)[e_1]_{\alpha,B_r^n}$$

Notice the LHS is the spacetime Holder semi-norm, while the RHS is the regular Holder semi-norm. Of course the same inequality holds true for any $D^\beta e_1$.

Since $\gamma_i \le m$, $\beta_i \le \ell$, we deduce

$$r^{\ell+2m+\alpha-1}[D^\ell \partial_t^m A]_{\alpha,B_{r/2}^{n,1}} \le c(n,\ell,\alpha)\epsilon.$$

For each t there is an inverse $A_t^{-1} \equiv A(\cdot,t)^{-1}$. By Lemma 10.1 applied to each $A(\cdot,t)$, we get

$$r^{\ell+\alpha-1}[D^\ell A^{-1}]_{\alpha,B_{r/2}^{n,1}} \le c(n,\ell,\alpha)\epsilon.$$

We work towards bounding the relevant t derivatives. For every t we have $A_t^{-1}(A_t(x)) \equiv x$, therefore any at point (x,t) we have

$$\partial_t A^{-1}|_x = -DA^{-1}|_x \star \partial_t A|_{A^{-1}(x)}.$$

Therefore,

$$r|\partial_t A^{-1}|_{0,B_{r/2}^{n,1}} \le r|DA^{-1}|_{0,B_{r/2}^{n,1}}|\partial_t A|_{0,B_r^{n,1}} \le c(n)\epsilon.$$

More generally, by induction we calculate that

$$D^\ell \partial_t^m A^{-1} = \sum D^{\alpha_1}A^{-1} \star \cdots \star D^{\alpha_p}A^{-1} \star D^{\beta_1}\partial_t^{\gamma_1}A|_{A^{-1}(x)} \star \cdots \star D^{\beta_q}\partial_t^{\gamma_q}A|_{A^{-1}(x)},$$

summing over $\alpha_i \ge 1$, $\beta_i \ge 0$, $\gamma_i \ge 1$, which satsify

$$\ell - 1 = \sum \alpha_i - p + \sum(\beta_i - 1)_+ \quad \text{and} \quad m - 1 = \sum \gamma_i - q$$

Hence

$$r^{\ell+2m+\alpha-1}[D^\ell \partial_t^m A^{-1}]_{\alpha,B_{r/2}^{n,1}} \le c(n,\ell,\alpha)\epsilon.$$

Combining above estimates gives the required bounds on ξ. We now look at η. We have immediately that

$$\begin{aligned}|\eta|_{0,B_{r/2}^{n,1}} &\le |e_2|_{0,B_r^{n,1}} \le r\epsilon \\ |D\eta|_{0,B_{r/2}^{n,1}} &\le |De_2|(1+|Du|)|DA^{-1}| \le c(n)\epsilon \\ |\partial_t\eta|_{0,B_{r/2}^{n,1}} &\le |De_2|(|\partial_t A^{-1}| + |\partial_t u| + |Du||\partial_t A^{-1}|) \le c(n)\epsilon/r.\end{aligned}$$

Let's look at higher derivatives. The same arguments as above applied to $D^\ell \partial_t^m (u \circ A_t^{-1})$ gives that

$$r^{\ell+2m+\alpha-1}[u \circ A^{-1}]_{\alpha, B^{n,1}_{r/2}} \leq c(n, \ell, \alpha).$$

Now we have, for any $m + \ell/2 \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} D^\ell \partial_t^m \eta = \sum D^\alpha e_2|_{(A^{-1}(x), u(A^{-1}(x)))} \star D^{\beta_1} \partial_t^{\gamma_1} A^{-1} \star \cdots \star D^{\beta_p} \partial_t^{\gamma_p} A^{-1} \\ \star D^{\delta_1} \partial_t^{\epsilon_1} (u \circ A^{-1}) \star \cdots \star D^{\delta_q} \partial_t^{\epsilon_q} (u \circ A^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

summing over $\alpha \geq 1$, $\beta_i, \gamma_i, \delta_i, \epsilon_i \geq 0$, with $\beta_i + \gamma_i \geq 1$, $\delta_i + \epsilon_i \geq 1$, all satisfying

$$\ell = \alpha + \sum (\beta_i - 1)_+ + \sum (\delta_i - 1)_+ \quad \text{and} \quad m - 1 = \sum (\gamma_i - 1)_+ + \sum (\epsilon_i - 1)_+.$$

As before, given $(x,t), (y,s) \in B^{n,1}_{r/2}$, we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} &|e_2(A_t^{-1}(x), u(A_t^{-1}(x), t)) - e_2(A_s^{-1}(y), u(A_s^{-1}(y), t))| \\ &\leq [e_2]_{\alpha, B^n_r} \left(|DA^{-1}| + r|\partial_t A^{-1}| + |Du|(|DA^{-1}| + r|\partial_t A^{-1}|) + r|\partial_t u| \right)^\alpha ||(x,t) - (y,s)||^\alpha \\ &\leq c(n, \alpha)[e_2]_{\alpha, B^n_r} ||(x,t) - (y,s)||^\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

with the same inequality true for $D^\alpha e_2$ in place of e_2. So

$$[e_2(A_t^{-1}(x), u(A_t^{-1}(x), t))]_{\alpha, B^{n,1}_{r/2}} \leq c(n, \alpha)[e_2]_{\alpha, B^n_r}$$

where again the LHS is a spacetime norm, but the RHS is a regular norm. We deduce that

$$r^{\ell+2m+\alpha-1}[D^\ell \partial_t^m \eta]_{\alpha, B^{n,1}_{r/2}} \leq c(n, \alpha, \ell)\epsilon. \qquad \square$$

Proposition 10.3. *Let $\mathcal{M}_i, \mathcal{M}$ be a sequence in $\mathcal{S}(n, N)$, where $\mathcal{M}_i \to \mathcal{M}$ as free-boundary Brakke flows. Suppose*

$$\inf_i r_{2,\alpha}(\mathcal{M}_i, 0) \geq \rho > 0.$$

Then 0 is a regular point of $\mathcal{M}$, and $\mathcal{M}_i$ converge to $\mathcal{M}$ is $C^{2,\alpha}$ near 0.

If, additionally, the barriers converge in C^∞, then convergence near 0 is smooth.

Proof. If 0 is uniformly bounded away from the barriers S_i, then this follows immediately from Arzela-Ascoli and interior Schauder estimates. However the geometric free-boundary condition is somewhat awkward when talking about graphs, not least because the domain of definition will change with time. We find it more natural to straighten the barrier.

Take $0 \in S$, and by replacing $\mathcal{M}_i$ with $\mathcal{M}_i - (\zeta_i(0), 0)$ we can assume $0 \in S_i$ also. Pass to a subsequence, rotate by a fixed amount in space, and replace $\mathcal{M}_i$ with $\mathcal{M}_i - (0, t_i)$ (with $t_i \to 0$) as necessary, and we have

$$\mathcal{M}_i \cap (B^{N-n}_\rho \times B^{n,1}_\rho) = \text{graph}(u^{(i)}),$$

where $u^{(i)} : Q_i \times I \subset B_\rho^{n,1} \to R$ is uniformly bounded in $C^{2,\alpha}$. Here I is either the interval $[-\rho^2, \rho^2]$ or $[-\rho^2, 0]$.

Let Φ_i, Φ be the map (2) straightening the barriers S_i, S (resp.), centered at 0. Using Lemma 10.2, we have

$$\Phi_i^{-1}(\text{graph}(u^{(i)})) = \text{graph}(\tilde{u}^{(i)}),$$

where $\tilde{u}^{(i)}$ is uniformly bounded in $C^{2,\alpha}$ also. There is a fixed half-space $H \subset R^n$, so that $\tilde{u}^{(i)} : H \times I \to R$ has Neumann boundary conditions in ∂H.

Arzela-Ascoli implies $\tilde{u}^{(i)}$ subsequentially converge in $C^{2,\alpha'}$ to some $\tilde{u} : H \times I \to R$. By definition of free-boundary convergence, $\Phi_i \to \Phi$ in $C^{2,\alpha}$. We deduce that

$$\mathcal{M} \cap (B_\rho^{N-n} \times B_\rho^{n,1}) = \Phi(\text{graph}(\tilde{u})) =: \text{graph}(u).$$

This shows $\mathcal{M}$ is proper and $C^{2,\alpha'}$ near 0.

$\tilde{u}$ is a graphical mean curvature flow in the pullback metric $\gamma = \Phi^* \delta$. Therefore $\tilde{u}$ satisfies

$$\partial_t \tilde{u} - g^{kl} D_{kl} \tilde{u} = 0, \tag{32}$$

where g^{kl} is the inverse to the matrix $\gamma(e_k + D_k u, e_l + D_l u)$. Provided ρ is sufficiently small, by (3) this is an elliptic equation, with coefficients as regular as $D\tilde{u}$. The usual bootstrap argument then gives C^∞.

Suppose the barriers converge smoothly $S_i \to S$. Each $\tilde{u}^{(i)}$ satisfies the graphical mean curvature equation (32), with the pullback metric $\gamma_i = \Phi_i^* \delta$:

$$\partial_t \tilde{u}^{(i)} = F(D\Phi_i, D\tilde{u}^{(i)}, D^2 \tilde{u}^{(i)})$$

for some analytic F. So the difference $w^{(i)} = \tilde{u}^{(i)} - \tilde{u}$ satisfies a linear PDE

$$\partial_t w^{(i)} = a_{kl}^{(i)} D_{kl} w^{(i)} + b_k^{(i)} D_k w^{(i)} + c_k^{(i)} D_k (\Phi_i - \Phi) =: L w^{(i)}.$$

Convergence of Φ_i and $w^{(i)}$ implies L is uniformly elliptic, with constant terms going to 0 in C^∞. The usual Schauder estimates then imply $w^{(i)} \to 0$ in C^∞ also. □

11 appendix: boundary monotonicity

The following boundary monotonicity formula appears in Allard [2].

Proposition 11.1 (Allard [2]). *Let V be an integral n-varifold with free-boundary in $S \subset U$. For any $0 < \tau < \sigma \leq r_S$, and any $h \in C_c^1(U, R)$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sigma^{-1} \int_{B_\sigma(S)} h|\nabla^T d|^2 + d\nabla^T h \cdot \nabla^T d + h d tr_V D^2 d + h dS^T H \cdot D d d\mu_V \\
&\quad - \tau^{-1} \int_{B_\tau(S)} h|\nabla^T d|^2 + d\nabla^T h \cdot \nabla^T d + h d tr_V D^2 d + h dS^T H \cdot D d d\mu_V \\
&= \int_{B_\sigma(S) \sim B_\tau(S)} \nabla^T h \cdot \nabla^T d + h tr_V D^2 d + h S^T H \cdot D d d\mu_V.
\end{aligned}$$

Here $d = d(\cdot, S)$.

In particular, by the dominated convergence theorem,

$$\sigma^{-1} \int_{B_\sigma(S)} h|\nabla^T d|^2 d\mu_V - \lim_{\tau \to 0} \tau^{-1} \int_{B_\tau(S)} h|\nabla^T d|^2 d\mu_V$$
$$= \int_{B_\sigma(S) \sim S} (1 - d/\sigma)(\nabla^T h \cdot \nabla^T d + h tr_V D^2 d + h S^T H \cdot Dd) d\mu_V.$$

Proof. Let X be the vector field

$$X = \phi(d/\rho) h(x) d Dd \equiv \phi(d) h(x)(x - \zeta(x).$$

We have

$$div_V(X) = \phi' |\nabla^T d|^2 h d + \phi d \nabla^T h \cdot \nabla^T d + \phi h |\nabla^T d|^2 + \phi h d tr_V D^2 d.$$

Therefore, if

$$I(\rho) = \int \phi(d/\rho) h(x) |\nabla^T d|^2 d\mu_V,$$

then

$$I - \rho I' = - \int \phi d \nabla^T h \cdot \nabla^T d + \phi h d tr_V D^2 d + \phi h d S^T H \cdot D d \mu_V.$$

Integrating the above relation between $\tau < \sigma$, and taking $\phi \to 1_{[0,1]}$, we obtain

$$\sigma^{-1} \int_{B_\sigma(S)} h|\nabla^T d|^2 d\mu_V - \tau^{-1} \int_{B_\tau(S)} h|\nabla^T d|^2 d\mu_V$$
$$= \int_\tau^\sigma \rho^{-2} \int_{B_\rho(S)} d \nabla^T h \cdot \nabla^T d + h d tr_V D^2 d + h d S^T H \cdot D d d\mu_V d\rho.$$

Apply the standard layer-cake formula to the measure

$$\nu(A) = \int_A d \nabla^T h \cdot \nabla^T d + d h tr_V D^2 d + h d S^T H \cdot D d d \mu_V,$$

to obtain

$$RHS = \int_{B_\sigma(S) \sim B_\tau(S)} d^{-1} d\nu - \sigma^{-1} \int_{B_\sigma(S)} d\nu + \tau^{-1} \int_{B_\tau(S)} d\nu,$$

which is the required equality. □

12 appendix: miscellanea

We collect some basic facts for the readers convenience.

Proposition 12.1. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a smooth, proper mean curvature flow, with free-boundary in a plane. Then the reflection $\tilde{\mathcal{M}} = \mathcal{M} + (\text{refl})_\sharp \mathcal{M}$ is a classical mean curvature flow without boundary.*

Proof. We can assume $P = \{x_1 = 0\}$. Clearly $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is a classical MCF away from the planar barrier P.

Suppose $(0, p') \in P \cap \tilde{\mathcal{M}}(t)$. Near $((0, p'), t)$ in spacetime we can write $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ as the evolution of the graph

$$\tilde{u}_t(x_1, x') = \begin{cases} u_t(x_1, x') & x_1 \leq 0 \\ u_t(-x_1, x') & x_1 > 0 \end{cases}.$$

By the free-boundary condition $\partial_{x_1} u|_{x_1=0} = 0$, and therefore $\tilde{u}$ is $C^{2,\alpha}$. So $\text{graph}(\tilde{u})$ satisfies the graphical mean curvature flow equation, and hence by the interior parabolic Schauder estimates is smooth. □

Proposition 12.2. *Let $\mathcal{M} \equiv (\mu(t))_{t \leq 0}$ be an ancient, self-shrinking Brakke flow in R^N, with $\Theta(\mathcal{M}) < \infty$. Then we have*

$$\Theta(\mathcal{M}, (x, t), r) \leq \Theta(\mathcal{M}) \quad \forall x, \quad \forall t \leq 0, \quad \forall r \geq 0.$$

It's not clear to me if this can be concluded for $t > 0$ without some extra assumption (e.g. finite entropy).

Proof. First consider the case $t = 0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta(\mathcal{M}, (x, 0), r) &= (4\pi r^2)^{-n/2} \int e^{\frac{-|y-x|^2+|y|^2}{4r^2}} e^{-|y|^2/2r^2} d\mu(-r^2)(y) \\ &= (1 + O(e^{-|x_0|^2/4r^2} - 1))\Theta(\mathcal{M}, 0, r) \\ &\to \Theta(\mathcal{M}) \quad \text{as } r \to \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Now for $t \leq 0$, write $t - r^2 = -s^2$, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta(\mathcal{M}, (x, t), r) &= (4\pi(s^2 + t))^{-n/2} \int e^{\frac{-|y-x|^2}{4(s^2+t)}} d\mu(-s^2)(y) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{s^2}{s^2 - t}\right)^{n/2} \Theta(\mathcal{M}, (x, 0), s) \\ &\to \Theta(\mathcal{M}) \quad \text{as } r \to \infty. \end{aligned}$$

The result follows by monotonicity. □

References

[1] W. Allard. On the first variation of a varifold. *Annals of Mathematics*, 95:417–491, 1972.

[2] W. Allard. On the first variation of a varifold: boundary behavior. *Annals of Mathematics*, 101:418–446, 1975.

[3] K. Brakke. *The motion of a surface by its mean curvature.* Princeton University Press, 1978.

[4] J. Buckland. Mean curvature flow with free boundary on smooth hypersurfaces. *J. reine angew. Math.*, 586:71–90, 2005.

[5] N. Edelen. Convexity estimates for mean curvature flow with free boundary. *Advances in Mathematics*, 294:1–36, 2016.

[6] M. Gruter. Regularity results for minimizing currents with a free-boundary. *J. reine angew. Math.*, pages 307–325, 1987.

[7] M. Gruter and J. Jost. Allard type regularity results for varifolds with free boundaries. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*, 13:129–169, 1986.

[8] G. Huisken. Asymptotic behavior for singularities of the mean curvature flow. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 31:285–299, 1990.

[9] T. Ilmanen. *Elliptic Regularization and Partial Regularity for Motion by Mean Curvature.* Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, 1993.

[10] A. Koeller. On the singular set of mean curvature flows with neumann free boundary conditions. 2010. arXiv:1012.0601.

[11] B. Lambert. The perpendicular neumann problem for mean curvature flow with a timelike cone boundary conditon. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 366:3373–3388, 2014.

[12] G. Lieberman. *Second Order Parabolic Differential Equations.* World Scientific, 1996.

[13] T. Marquardt. The inverse mean curvature flow for hypersurfaces with boundary. thesis.

[14] U. Menne. Second order rectifiability of integral varifolds of locally bounded first variation. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 23:709–763, 2013.

[15] M. Mizuno and Y. Tonegawa. Convergence of the allen-cahn equation with neumann boundary conditions. 2014. arXiv:1403.5624.

[16] A. Stahl. Convergence of solutions to the mean curvauture flow with a neumann boundary condition. *Calc. Variations & PDE*, 4:421–441, 1996.

[17] A. Stahl. Regularity estimates for solutions to the mean curvature flow with a neumann boundary condition. *Calc. Variations & PDE*, 4:385–407, 1996.

[18] A. Volkmann. Free boundary problems governed by mean curvature. thesis.

[19] V. Wheeler. Non-parametric radially symmetric mean curvature flow with a free boundary. *Math. Z.*, 276:281–298, 2014.

[20] B. White. A local regularity theorem for mean curvature flow. *Annals of Mathematics*, 161:1487–1519, 2005.

[21] B. White. The maximum principle for minimal varieties of arbitrary codimension. *Communications in Analysis and Geometry*, 18, 2009.